

**CEP Expert Workshop on Enhancing the Implementation of
Framework Decision 2008/947/JHA and 2009/829/JHA
10-11 September 2025 in Brussels, Belgium**

Participants

1. Beun M.C. (Marina)
2. Borg Carmen
3. Buderman Christy
4. Danglades Daniel
5. Farinpour Ramin
6. Fini Michele
7. Fiorillo Chiara
8. Hamrén Linn
9. Hassett Peter
10. Jakešová Mirka
11. Jörlemann Tina
12. Jurčenko Eva
13. Kaczorowska Urszula
14. Karjalainen Katja
15. Kuijer Leontien
16. Lewis Melinda
17. Loughry Sile
18. Luyten Lisa
19. Martinez Bernal Maximo
20. Mataciute Loreta
21. McCormack Leah
22. McNally Gerry
23. Nijmeijer Anne
24. Ormandzhiev Hristo
25. Pegers Malin
26. Popa Bogdan
27. Ratajczak Natalia
28. Rohner Andrea
29. Špero Kamenjarin Jana
30. Starič Strajnar Barbara
31. Van Buggenhout Tom
32. van Opdenbosch Kris
33. Vauthier Anne
34. Wolter Daniel

Background

The Expert Workshop held on September 10–11, 2025, in Brussels, Belgium, brought together senior managers, probation practitioners, criminal justice professionals such as lawyers and prosecutors from across Europe as well as representatives of the [European Commission](#), [Academy of European Law](#) and [European Judicial Network](#) to discuss the advancements in the implementation of Framework Decisions 2008/947/JHA and 2009/829/JHA. Hosted at the Houses of Justice, the CEP Expert Workshop served as a dynamic platform for mutual learning, collaboration, and strategic planning.

The programme covered a broad spectrum of expertise and experience taking into account national, cross-border experience combining practitioner-level insights and operational tools with systemic recommendations and institutional coordination. Gerry McNally and Mirka Jakesova (CEP) presented shared findings from the 9th Round of Mutual Evaluation and preliminary findings of CEP survey. Chiara Fiorillo from the DG Justice and Consumers shared updates and priorities from the European Commission. Presentations from the Netherlands, Latvia, and Romania illustrated diverse experiences with implementing the Framework Decisions, including successes and challenges while Irish representatives showcased their solution-oriented approaches. The updates from EJN as well as updates on ERA and EMRPO projects were shared by Natalia Ratajczak, Ramin Farinpour and Daniel Danglades.

Experts from Ireland, the Netherlands, Germany, Latvia, and Spain explored trust-building across jurisdictions, emphasizing cultural, legal, and operational nuances in the interactive roundtable. Solution-oriented approach was addressed in the group sessions with participants drafting the action plan on successful implementation of Framework Decisions within their respective organisations. Last but not least, CEP presented newly updated flyer and guide for [Framework Decisions](#).

The workshop underscored the importance of mutual trust, shared learning, and coordinated implementation of EU justice policies. Participants left with renewed commitment and actionable insights to enhance cross-border probation and judicial cooperation.

Presentations:

- 1. Messages from the 9th Round of Mutual Evaluation and CEP survey results** / Gerry McNally, University of Cork, Ireland and Mirka Jakesova, CEP, Czech Republic

Introduction on the results of the CEP survey regarding the implementation, practical use, training, experience within Probation Services across Europe. The

findings of the CEP Survey compared with the findings of the 9th Round of Mutual Evaluation. For more information, see the presentation.

2. European Judicial Network update / Natalia Ratajczak, EJN Secretariat, The Netherlands

Update provided on the organization of EJN as well as current assignments such as 11th Round of Mutual Evaluation, HLF on the Future of Criminal Justice, Council Conclusions on cooperation with third countries, contact point meetings in Latvia (covering all 3 Baltic states). For more information, see the presentation.

3. Case Netherlands – How it started? / Melinda Lewis, Dutch Probation Service, The Netherlands

Update provided on the organization and tasks of the International Desk working within the Dutch Probation Service that deals with the Framework Decisions. For more information, see the presentation.

4. Case Latvia – How it works? / Eva Jurčenko, State Probation Service of Latvia

Update provided on the application of Framework Decisions within the State Probation Service of Latvia including an example of case study, information on staff training, observations and topics for further discussion. For more information, see the presentation.

5. Case Romania - Reason of Refusal / Bogdan Popa, Arad Probation Office, Romania

Presentation provided a practical case example with clear explanations on legal framework, role of probation service, ground for refusal as well as the information on following actions – adaptation of the sanction to the national legal framework, final conclusions. For more information, see the presentation.

6. Framework Decisions solution oriented - Irish approach / Sile Loughry, Probation Service, Ireland and Leah McCormack, Parole Board, Ireland

Update provided on the Irish international desk, transfer of sentences with an explanation on common law applied in Ireland vs continental law applied across Europe, cooperation with Northern Ireland, parole board and life sentence including potential transfer. For more information, see the presentation.



7. ERA: project update / Ramin Farinpour, ERA, Germany

Update provided on the state of play of the project, past and upcoming activities and milestones within the project.

8. EMRPO: project update / Daniel Danglades, Prison and Probation Service, France

Update provided on the state of play of the project, past and upcoming activities and milestones within the project.

Interactive sessions included the roundtable with a prosecutor, senior manager and practitioners discussing the answers from the round of “speed introduction” answering the two things participants want to change or do to make things better for 947 and 829.

The overview of some answers (for more see attached the photo):

- 1) How to deal with cases when clients do not comply with a transfer which is regarded necessary.
- 2) How can we oblige competent authorities to engage on an application. No consequences for not responding.
- 3) Enhance trust between MS (including among judges, prosecutors etc) and how to involve them.
- 4) Inclusion of life-sentenced persons.
- 5) Contact points (including shared FAQ or common email address to share specific queries in real time) and increased knowledge regarding practices in probation service.

Next interactive session included work group sessions that built on previously identified problems, explored practical, realistic solutions for 947 and 829, and engaged participants in shaping next steps.

Participants were asked to develop a plan taking into account:

- ✓ Must Have (to be implemented as soon as possible)
- ✓ Good to Have (valuable improvements that do not need to be done now but in the foreseeable future)
- ✓ Nice to Have (something beneficial but not essential at this point)



Key takeways:

- Reaching out with our know-how supporting all when it comes to project and other initiatives.
- Champion who takes responsibility and leadership in each jurisdiction.
- Sharing and partnerships across jurisdictions, also across Europe, encourage local countries to get in touch.
- Being active, sharing info with next door neighbour but also with this group.

Actions

- 1) Publish the report.
- 2) Online event in between – spring 2026 (more information shared via email).
- 3) F2f event – will be specified – in September 2026 the ERA has a seminar on the FDs in Bucharest.
- 4) Data collection – continuation of the data gatherings.
- 5) Flyers updated will be shared with a request to share them further.

Link: <https://www.cep-probation.org/recap-expert-workshop-on-framework-decision-2008-947-jha-and-2009-829-jha/>