CALL FOR PROPOSALS
HOME/2014/ISFP/AG/LAWX

LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION EXCHANGE

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION
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<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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NOTICE
All personal data (such as names, addresses, CVs, etc.) mentioned in your Application form will be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the EU institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data. Your replies to the questions in this form are necessary in order to assess your grant application and they will be processed solely for that purpose by the department responsible for the Union grant programme concerned. On request, you may be sent personal data to correct or complete it. For any questions relating to this data, please contact the Commission department to which the form must be returned. Applicants may lodge a complaint against the processing of their personal data with the European Data Protection Supervisor at any time (Official Journal L 8, 12.1.2001).
PART 1 – DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

1.1. Summary of the project (max 4000 characters)

Provide an overall description of the project, including the project objective(s), activities, number and type of (short, medium and long term) beneficiaries, expected results. This summary should give readers a clear idea of what the project is about. It should be structured but descriptive; it should not merely provide lists of objectives, activities, beneficiaries and results. It should be identical to the summary contained in section 4.2 of the Application Form.

The Commission reserves the right to publish the summary for publication/dissemination purposes.

The project “Universal Message Format 3” (UMF 3) intends to support information exchange between law enforcement authorities (LEA) by further developing the UMF standard and implementing it within national systems as well as preparing a governance model for the long-term product development, administration and support of the UMF standard.

On 30 November 2009, the Council approved Conclusions on an Information Management Strategy (IMS) for EU internal security. In light of the need for effective and secure cross border exchange of information and the constantly increasing volume of such exchanges the work by the Council on an update of the IMS is ongoing. Interoperability of information systems is both a prerequisite and a facilitator for the efficient access to, availability and exchange of information throughout the EU.

The implementation of the IMS has been entrusted to the Working Party on Data Protection and Information Exchange (DAPIX). The DAPIX has since then composed lists of concrete, actionable initiatives to implement the IMS. UMF as a standard supporting interoperability has remained an item on the action lists from the very beginning. The “Draft Council Conclusions on an updated Information Management Strategy (IMS) for EU internal security” (15701/1/14 REV 1) have recognized in particular the progress made on the Universal Message Format (UMF) for an enhanced structured information exchange across border, and the further development of the Universal Message Format (UMF) as one of the key elements of the EU information exchange architecture. This progress included the results of the two EU funded projects “UMF” and “UMF 2” which concluded a clear business case and the requirement for the further enhancement of the UMF standard.

Workstream 1 ("UMF Development") concentrates on defining an enhanced version of the UMF standard. It will be based on requirements for cross-border information exchange by MS and European Institutions, such as Europol, euLISA or Frontex, and even from Interpol as an international partner in the project.

The output of this workstream, a new version of the UMF standard, will directly benefit the pilot projects and any other Member States (MS) or organizations wishing to use the enhanced version of UMF.

Workstream 2 ("Governance Concept") concentrates on designing and preparing the necessary procedures and structures for the continuous development and implementation of the standard UMF together with all partners. It will be based on the requirements of the partners (MS and organizations) for governance in order to ensure the quality of the standard and its acceptance among the partners.

The output of this workstream, a concept for UMF governance, will directly benefit all present and future partners wishing to use the UMF in operational systems. In addition, political bodies and organizations responsible for strategic decision on information management (e.g. DAPIX, European or International Institutions) will be able to participate in the process and access its results.

Workstream 3 ("Pilot Projects") includes all pilot projects. One pilot will be carried out by Europol allowing partners to access person information via a “Search Web Service”. Five additional pilots in MS will prepare their systems to access the service offered by Europol via a UMF interface.

As a result, these pilot projects will enable end users in the respective MS either to access Europol
In addition, an interface based on the UMF standard will allow a simplified extension either to further partners offering access to their information, like Europol will do, or to further users querying that information, like the MS. In the long term, extended usage of UMF in different systems will prove and improve the interoperability even if, initially, there is no direct link between those systems.

1.2. Conformity with the "Law Enforcement Information Exchange" Call for Proposals

1.2.1. To which priority(ies) of the Call for Proposals does this project refer?

- The establishment or streamlining of structures and methods for cross-border information exchange in line with the recommendations of the European Information Exchange Model (EIXM)
- Supporting the exchange of PNR data and of analytical information obtained from PNR data between national Passenger Information Units (PIUs) of different Member States.

1.2.2. To which expected outcome(s) specified in the Call for Proposals does this project refer?

Under the priority "Establishment or streamlining of structures and methods for cross-border information exchange in line with the recommendations of the European Information Exchange Model (EIXM)"

- Increase the interoperability or the efficiency in the use of existing instruments for cross-border information exchange by:
  - further developing or implementing the UMF standard;
  - fostering the cooperation between cross-border coordination units (SPOCs) in line with commonly developed guidelines (Council document 10492/14);
  - developing integrated access portals to relevant information systems;
  - enhancing data sharing with Europol or Europol Information Systems or enhancing the use of the SIENA communication tool;
  - stepping up the cooperation between PCCCCs and of PCCCCs with central national authorities and/ or Europol.
  - streamlining or improving the post-hit follow-up exchanges based on the Prüm Decision (Council Decision 2008/615/JHA)

Under the priority "supporting the exchange of PNR data and of analytical information obtained from PNR data between national Passenger Information Units (PIUs) of different Member States"

- Increase the level of efficiency in the use of PNR data for law enforcement purposes;
- Improve the efficiency of the sharing of this data with the harmonisation of standards in the various Member States involved;
- Explore how to best involve Europol and its existing channels for transferring data between national PIUs;
- Ensuring effective and adequate safeguards for protection of personal data;
- Sharing of experiences and best practices between Member States.

1.2.3.1 Which type(s) of eligible activity specified in the Call for Proposals will the project involve?

- projects promoting networking, public-private partnerships, mutual confidence, understanding and learning, identification and dissemination of best practices and innovative approaches at Union level, training and exchange programmes;
- projects supporting the development of methodological, notably statistical, tools and methods and common indicators;
- the acquisition, maintenance and/or further upgrading of technical equipment, expertise, and related systems, especially ICT systems and their components at the Union level;
projects enhancing awareness of Union policies and objectives among stakeholders and the general public, including corporate communication on the political priorities of the Union;

particularly innovative projects developing new methods and/or deploying new technologies with a potential for transferability to other Member States, especially projects aiming at testing and validating the outcome of Union funded security research projects;

studies and pilot projects.

1.2.3.2 Which type(s) of eligible activity specified in the Call for Proposals in or in relation with third countries will the project involve? (only applicable if third countries are involved in the project)

projects promoting networking, public-private partnerships, mutual confidence, understanding and learning, identification and dissemination of best practices and innovative approaches at Union level, training and exchange programmes;

projects supporting the development of methodological, notably statistical, tools and methods and common indicators;

the acquisition, maintenance and/or further upgrading of technical equipment, expertise, and related systems, especially ICT systems and their components at the Union level;

projects enhancing awareness of Union policies and objectives among stakeholders and the general public, including corporate communication on the political priorities of the Union;

particularly innovative projects developing new methods and/or deploying new technologies with a potential for transferability to other Member States, especially projects aiming at testing and validating the outcome of Union funded security research projects;

studies and pilot projects.

1.2.4 Project objectives (max 4000 characters)

Give an overview of the project objectives explaining how the project addresses the priority(ies) and contributes to the expected outcome(s) indicated above. Define indicators for measuring the outcome of the project.

Project Coordination

Only a widely used standard can be successful and support interoperability. The full potential of a standard like UMF can only be realized when there is a sufficient number of active UMF implementations. Users who have implemented UMF in their systems and later wish to develop a new service will then easily find other UMF partners allowing for a seamless, speedy and less costly implementation.

Therefore, in addition to supporting the three Workstreams, the central task of the project coordination is raising awareness and interest among the law enforcement community, including national authorities as well as central organizations, throughout Europe and, if possible, beyond Europe. This shall be supported through adequate outreach functions, including communication with the EU authorities and presentation of project objectives and results to a wider audience of law enforcement authorities.

Workstream 1 “UMF Development”

Primary Objectives:

- Collection and analysis of requirements for the new version of the UMF standard.
- Agreement among partners on the relevant requirements and the implementation in the new version.
- Development of the new UMF version based on the agreement.
- Support for pilot projects in implementing UMF.

Under this Workstream a new version of UMF will be developed fit for use in the pilot projects thus enabling the implementation of the standard in an operational environment. By extending the standard it can be more easily applied to other systems as well.
**Workstream 2 “Governance Concept”**

Primary Objectives:
- Collection and analysis of requirements for the governance (structures and processes) of the UMF standard.
- Agreement among partners on the relevant requirements.
- Analysis of existing structures intended or suitable for the maintenance of information standards.
- Negotiation of possible governance designs with involved parties (e.g. with organizations intended to fulfil functions for UMF governance).
- Design of governance structure and processes for endorsement by UMF 3 partners.

The Workstream develops a suitable governance for the further development and implementation of UMF thus enabling UMF as a long-term standard and solution which must be adapted to new needs of police work in Europe. Also it will support quality and acceptance of the standard by adequate integration of all partners.

**Workstream 3 “Pilot Projects”**

To a large extent the pilot projects can be executed in each Member State and Europol independently (e.g. design, development, training). By reducing interdependencies between pilots this simultaneously reduces coordination work and project risks. Overall the pilot projects have to adhere to standard project phases of initiation, analysis, design, development, testing and roll-out, but the precise definition of activities may differ from pilot to pilot.

Still, various outcomes are expected from each project and a number of steps must be taken together (coordinated or facilitated by the central management of UMF 3 project, e.g. testing) or must be carried out in direct cooperation with Workstream 1 “UMF Development” (e.g. collection and analysis of requirements for the new version of the UMF standard).

Primary Objectives:
- Central pilot project coordination ensures synchronization and proper execution of all pilot projects.
- Coordinated definition of requirements for the interface and the new version of the UMF standard ensure a complete and agreed collection of requirements.
- Centrally supported testing will facilitate this task for Europol and the Member State pilot projects and ensure proper implementation of the UMF standard.

The Workstream develops implementations of the UMF standard in the Europol and national systems enabling end users to access the relevant information in a new or improved way within their own system. The pilots will thus evaluate and prove the applicability of UMF in operational environments and support its acceptance.

**1.2.5. Expected results (max 2000 characters)**

Describe what the project will achieve in terms of outputs and deliverables. Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities, for example:
- Outputs: conference, seminar, training, event, knowledge;
- Deliverables: manual, leaflet, DVD, research paper, website.

Main direct outputs of the central project management and Workstreams 1 and 2 include:
- Project Meetings, Pilot Project Board Meetings and Steering Committee Meetings for project coordination and decision making;
- Conferences and UMF Outreach and Coordination activities to further the wide-spread understanding and use of UMF;
- Focus Meetings and Analysis Visits for requirement analysis and UMF and Governance development;
- Agreements on requirements, a new UMF version candidate and a Governance structure evaluation.
Indirectly this shall result in an improved understanding of UMF in all partner countries and organizations and an increased awareness among EU Member States of importance of structured LEA information exchange and the need for common standards to support interoperability.

The deliverables of the central project management and Workstreams 1 and 2 include:
- Reports, minutes or conclusions for the meetings and conferences;
- Lists of agreed requirements (UMF and Governance);
- New version of the UMF standard (UML model);
- Proposal for UMF Governance;
- UMF 3 project documentation.

Main outputs of the pilot projects concentrate on:
- Pilot project meetings;
- Training;
- Improved knowledge about and experience with UMF and its methodology.

Main deliverables of the pilot projects include:
- Project and test plans;
- Functional and technical designs;
- Software such as Web services, modified query applications, Web application forms;
- Documentation, including various types of manuals;

1.3. Quality of the proposed action

1.3.1. Activities (max 2000 characters)

Describe the project activities providing a clear overview of what will be done during the project (activities are to be listed in detail in Part 3).

Workstream 1:
Results of the previous UMF 2 project will be extended to definitions of additional data objects for an enhanced version of the UMF standard. For this purpose requirements will be collected from pilot projects and analysed and a new version of the UMF will be developed. In order to cover most of the requirements within Europe, there are not only the MS involved but also European Institutions, such as Europol, euLISA, Frontex and even Interpol as an international association. The results of Workstream 1 will be used to implement the pilot projects described in Workstream 3.

Workstream 2:
Achieving the EU-wide use of a UMF standard among LEAs requires continuous maintenance and development of the standard which in turn require transparent processes and structures (governance) that allow all potential partners to participate. An outreach function shall be developed to further the use of UMF and to ensure that new (or renewal) projects for LEA information exchange are aware of the standard and its potential and able to integrate it into the design if desired. A support function will be needed to help the proper implementation of UMF in such projects and to collect and process new requirements. Building on the outcome of the UMF 2 projects governance requirements for UMF will be collected and agreed upon with project partners, suitable governance structure designed and prepared.

Workstream 3: MS participating in this workstream and Europol will technically prepare to communicate with each other and demonstrate that standardized inquiries and responses, based on the UMF definitions under Workstream 1, do work under real conditions among several Organizations and Member States. Successful outcomes of these pilot implementations will show that a wide ranging efficient exchange of structured information is feasible as soon as more systems of MS or international partners adapt the UMF standard.
1.3.2. Methodology (max 2000 characters)

Outline the approach and methodology underpinning the project activities. Explain why they are the most suitable for achieving the project's objectives.

The importance of efficient information exchange between LEAs across European and even international borders in light of globalized crime and terrorism is undisputed. At the same time the necessity for improved interoperability between the information systems and services of the involved authorities is equally obvious and has been repeatedly stressed in the Council of the European Union (e.g. in its IMS).

Standards for structured information exchange, as a indispensable tool for effective and efficient communication, support the speed and flexibility of the implementation of information systems as well as the swiftness and quality of the operational communication itself.

The development as a ‘community standard’, i.e. a standard developed by the partners who will later use it, is important to ensure quality and acceptance of the standard. Obviously, quality is crucial to achieve added value and hence the willingness and desire to use the standard. Only by involving as many partners as possible the standard can consider and respect the specific requirements each partner may have. At the same time, the participation of as many partners as possible (and in fact, opening up the entire process to all partners who wish to join) will create acceptance of the method as well as its contents.

The UMF 3 project with its wide range of partners within Europe and beyond, provides a platform where a broad range of requirements can be introduced into the standard. A proper governance will allow to maintain and develop the standard at high quality while keeping all partners involved in the process.

The pilot projects will allow improving the standard to be used under operational daily life conditions. Evaluating and demonstrating its practicality will further the acceptance in all partner states. The introduction of the standard into national and international systems facilitate the understanding of the methodology will facilitate the application of UMF in further IT systems.

1.3.3. Project management, monitoring and evaluation (max 2000 characters)

Explain the overall project management concept, in particular how decisions will be taken and how permanent and effective communication will be ensured. Also, describe how you intend to monitor and evaluate the advancement of the project.

Workstream 1: For UMF development partners will collect and analyse requirements in a core group (for efficiency limited to a number of topic-experts from different partners working in Focus Meetings and “at home”). The results will be checked and validated by the full group in Project Meetings to assure wide applicability and acceptance. Results will feed into the pilot projects of Workstream 3. Lessons learned from the decision process of Workstream 1 (the first time UMF is developed in this wide group in the EU) will feed into Workstream 2.

Workstream 2: For Governance development partners will collect and analyse requirements in a core group (see WS1 above). The results will be checked and validated by the full group in Project Meetings to assure wide applicability and acceptance.

Workstream 3: Pilot Projects will be executed within each country or organization while only being coordinated at the central level by the UMF 3 management. Decisions will be taken independently within the pilot project where appropriate; if necessary overarching decisions will be taken together in the Pilot Project Board meetings. In case of unresolved conflicts, issues can be escalated to a Steering Committee (see also 1.3.4 below).

The central UMF 3 project management will coordinate Workstream cooperation and it will lead and monitor all Workstreams.
1.3.4. Risks and measures to mitigate them (max 2000 characters)

Describe possible risks, uncertainties, difficulties related to the project implementation and the measures/strategy that you plan to undertake to mitigate them.

**General risks:**

- Loss of staff or financing, conflicts with other high priority projects, and in the case of pilot projects: time delays due to subcontractor/delivery problems

→ Standard mitigation measures/strategy:

Central project planning, continuous progress reports; for pilot projects a Steering Committee (with high-ranking representatives from all pilot project countries, e.g. the CIOs of the involved organizations, which shall be in a position to affect necessary communication and decisions within their respective organizations)

**Specific risks:**

- Too many or too difficult new requirements for the standard from the pilot projects

→ A first assessment (completed before this application) yielded low likelihood;

→ Continuous monitoring of requirements

- Changes necessary in UMF because of the new requirements cannot be agreed upon OR
- No agreement can be reached on requirements for UMF governance OR
- No (existing) structure or organization is found appropriate for UMF governance

→ Strong involvement of all partners in discussion and decision process;

→ Emphasis on non-mandatory nature of UMF;

→ Creating acceptance through transparency of decision making process and strategic goals;

→ Investigation and analysis of existing governance solutions for international information standards

- Pilot project not able to complete tasks due to internal obstacles (e.g. conflicting architecture requirements)

→ Early definition of full, detailed pilot project plans;

→ Close communication with steering committee members of all pilot project partners

- Pilot projects encounter technical problems in the connection between partners

→ Clear and synchronized project planning with continuous coordination between partners;

→ Extended testing and bug-fixing period

1.3.5. Dissemination strategy (max 2000 characters)

Describe the dissemination strategy: how will you reach the short, medium and long term beneficiaries? Explain what will be disseminated (key message, deliverables), to whom (short, medium and long term beneficiaries), why (purpose), how (method and tools) and when (timing). Please note rules on visibility of the EU funding in the Grant Agreement.
In the short term the pilot project partners and their end users will benefit most and directly. They are reached by means of the roll-out plans in each of the pilot projects. The immediate benefit will be a new or improved query service available to end users. Also IT organizations carrying out the pilot projects can gain substantial experience with the UMF standard and with the general approach, allowing them to apply the methodology more easily for future information exchange projects.

In the medium term all other project partners without pilot projects will also benefit, due to their experience with UMF and the possibility to prepare their national strategy and systems early for the implementation of UMF when an opportunity arises. Based on the pilot projects, in which a variety of different architectures will already have implemented UMF, follow up projects will also be possible (basically “copying” a pilot’s approach, architecture and/or solution).

In the long term the full added value of a standard like UMF can be obtained. Successful pilot projects and follow-up projects, if properly communicated, will lead to further UMF based systems and interfaces and they will create interest in other LEAs. The wide range of countries as well as organizations integrated into UMF 3 allows for an effective outreach to new potential partners.

The conferences planned for the UMF 3 project will extend not only to project partners but to all interested parties of the law enforcement community within Europe and possibly beyond (at least via Interpol). As such they will allow communicating the results of the project activities and the advantages obtained by the involved partners during the project duration. Also, the development of UMF Governance processes and structures as an output of Workstream 2 shall provide the framework for a continuous and effective maintenance as well as dissemination of the UMF standard and methodology after the UMF 3 project has ended.

1.4. European Added Value

1.4.1. European dimension of the project *(max 2000 characters)*

Illustrate the European dimension of the planned activities. Which countries will be directly involved in the project activities? Where will the activities take place?

19 countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy(?), Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and the United Kingdom) and 4 organizations (euLISA, Europol, Frontex and Interpol) will be directly involved in the project. In addition, 2 organizations (Eurojust and OLAF) will take part as observers.

Within each country one or more organizations and/or authorities such as central law enforcement authorities as well as relevant ministries or support organizations (e.g. for information technology) will be directly involved.

Moreover, the working group DAPIX at the EU Council will be indirectly involved as it monitors regularly the progress of the UMF initiative in the context of the Action List of the Information Management Strategy (IMS) of the Council.

As far as Workstreams 1 and 2 are concerned most activities will take place in Germany (as the Applicant) and at Europol (which has led the development of the current version of the UMF standard in the project UMF 2 completed in May 2014) in the Netherlands.

The activities will be supported by participating partners who will gather, analyze and process relevant information within their own countries which is needed for the further development of the standard UMF (Workstream 1) or for the definition of the requirements for a UMF Governance (Workstream 2).

The pilot projects within Workstream 3 will be executed within each pilot partner’s country or organization, i.e. at Europol (in The Hague, Netherlands), as well as in Estonia, Finland, Greece, Poland and Spain. Coordination tasks will be carried out in Germany in the context of the overall project
management, too.

1.4.2. Impact on the EU scale *(max 2000 characters)*

Demonstrate the European dimension of the project. Which countries will directly and indirectly benefit from the project?

The short term and most direct benefit will be created in the pilot partner states, where new or improved police information services will be available to end users in the police organizations combating crime and terrorism. Higher quality and efficiency of the communication will lead to better results. Fewer resources than before will be required because structured information can more easily be transmitted and processed automatically, whereas unstructured information must often be handled manually.

The medium term benefit will extend to all UMF 3 project partners who should be in a position to implement the UMF standard within their systems whenever the opportunity arises. The long term benefit can extend to all Member States of the EU and beyond.

Considering the importance of efficient information exchange between law enforcement authorities (cf. Section 1.3.2), a successful project UMF 3 and the continuation of the UMF initiative will benefit all European States. Efficient information exchange does not only assist the actively involved partners but their improved or supported police operations will indirectly benefit all other countries, at least indirectly by contributing to more efficient crime fighting.

At the same time, basing police information exchange on structured information standards will facilitate the inclusion of data protection and privacy requirements. Respecting these principles, will continue with and even improve the protection of individual rights and the trust of the citizens in an efficient LEA work.
**PART 2 – DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICANTS**

### 2.1. Partnership *(max 2000 characters)*

Explain why the individual Applicant and Co-applicants are the best suited to participate in this project. When building your partnership you should think of organisations that can help you reaching an objective/solving a problem.

Germany (Applicant) is well prepared for the management and coordination of UMF 3 because of its experience in the projects UMF and UMF 2. Comprehensive experience in development, maintenance and implementation of its national police information model (XPolizei) as a standard for police information exchange, will firmly add to the project. Although a national standard must partially contain different items and structures than a European or international standard, the underlying requirements and methods are very similar throughout all of police work and information management.

Austria Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland (Co-Applicant Countries) and Denmark, United Kingdom (Associate Partner Countries) are important partners due to their wide ranging expertise regarding the national business and technical requirements of police information exchange throughout Europe.

Europol (Associate Partner Organization) brings in its experience with the UMF standard proven by the projects UMF and UMF 2 as well as its skills evidenced by the successful implementation of UMF in SIENA. Together with euLISA and Frontex (also Associate Partner Organizations) their experience and competence as European Law Enforcement Authorities and their record of direct interaction with all MS will strongly support the goals of the project. Likewise Interpol (Co-Applicant Organization) will enter its unique knowledge and competence in international police information exchange. Thus, the UMF 3 project can take into account the communication requirements even of LEA partners outside of Europe.

### 2.2. Roles of Applicants *(max 2000 characters)*

Explain what the Applicant and each Co-applicant will do in the project. Each Co-applicant should have a specific and well-clarified role and should actively participate in the project activities.

Germany (Applicant) will coordinate and manage the overall project UMF consisting of the three Workstreams (see above). It will also strongly support the two central WS (UMF Standard, Governance) in their execution with its experience in the projects UMF and UMF 2 as well as with its experience with its national police information standard.

Europol (Associate Partner) will execute a pilot project offering a web service with an interface based on UMF to all other pilot projects partners. It will further strongly support the two central parts (UMF Standard, Governance) with its experience in the implementation of UMF in SIENA.

Estonia, Finland, Greece, Poland and Spain (Co-Applicants) will execute pilot projects accessing the web service offered by Europol, integrating the query service into their national infrastructure and making it available to end users. At the same time they will actively support the two central parts (UMF Standard, Governance) with their pilots, e.g. by defining requirements for the development of UMF.

Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland (Co-Applicant Countries) and Denmark, United Kingdom (Associate Partner Countries) as well as Interpol (Co-Applicant Organization), euLISA and Frontex (Associate Partner Organizations) will also support the two central parts with the further development of the standard UMF and/or its Governance.

Together the partners will collect, define, analyse and agree on requirements for the further development of the UMF standard and its Governance. They will develop and scrutinize solutions for
both Workstreams and prepare the necessary decisions to be taken after the completion of the UMF 3 project. These decisions to be taken by relevant bodies shall ensure the continued development and support of the standard for its practical use for the time after the conclusion of the UMF3 project.

2.3. **Staff involved**

List all project staff included in the budget (under Budget heading A) by function (e.g. project manager, financial manager, researcher) and describe shortly their tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Staff Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Manager:</strong></td>
<td>DE: BKA, PG ZIR, Dr. Patrick Voss - de Haan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Project Staff:</strong></td>
<td>DE: BKA, PG ZIR, Sebastian Kissel, Thomas Klaslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT: BMI, Peter Hanel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Manager:</strong></td>
<td>DE: Sebastian Fleischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot Projects Staff:</strong></td>
<td>5 Pilot Projects of Co-Applicants (Estonia, Finland, Greece, Poland, Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pilot Project of an Associate Partner (Europol, not funded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**PART 3 – DESCRIPTION OF WORK PACKAGES AND ACTIVITIES**

**Explanatory Notice**

In Part 3 describe in detail the activities that you will undertake in order to achieve the objectives you described in Part 1 of this document. This section is divided into work packages, i.e.: sets of activities leading to a specific output or deliverable that you wish to produce.

Any project will have a minimum of two work packages: Work package 0 with the management and coordination activities and Work package 1 with outputs/deliverables related to the objective(s) of the project. As many additional work packages as necessary can be introduced by copying Work package 1. The division should be logical and guided by the different identifiable results of an activity. For example "production of a manual", "organisation of a conference" or "training" could be each one separate work package. Under each work package you should then enter an objective, list specific activities that you will undertake and list outputs and deliverables of the work package.

▶ **Work package 0**

**Work package 0: Management and Coordination of the Project**

**What is "Work package 0"?**

Work package 0 is intended for all activities related to the general management and coordination of the project (meetings, coordination, project monitoring and evaluation, financial management) and all the activities which are cross cutting and therefore difficult to assign just to one specific work package. In such case, instead of splitting them across many work packages please enter and describe them in Work package 0. For this reason it has a different layout where you do not have to enter objectives and duration. Nevertheless this work package will have its own deliverables (e.g. final report, work plan, evaluation report) and outputs (e.g. meetings).

**I. Description of the work (activities)**

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section III).

- A0.1 Central Project Management
- A0.2 Pilot Project Coordination and Monitoring
- A0.3 Outreach and Coordination with relevant partners
- A0.4 Dissemination of project results to relevant target groups

**II. Results (outputs and deliverables)**

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers.

Examples of outputs and deliverables for work package 0:
- **Outputs** – kick-off meetings, coordination meetings, steering committees
- **Deliverables** – report, minutes, agreements

**II.a. Output(s) of this work package**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O0.0</td>
<td>European Commission Projects information meeting</td>
<td>Establish and align project teams &amp; planning, (1 meeting with 23 partners with 1 participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O0.1</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| O0.2  | Opening Conference | Introduce project objectives and UMF methodology to a wider audience to prepare acceptance; attract further (future) partners for inclusion into strategy. (1 conference with 2 participants from each EU-MS and international organizations.) |
| O0.3  | Project Meetings   | Coordinate three Workstreams and align overall progress, discuss Focus Meetings results of Workstream 1 and 2; take decisions on requirements and solutions. (5 meetings with 23 partners with 2 participants each.) |
| O0.4  | Pilot Project Board Meetings | Coordinate all pilot projects (Workstream 3) and align overall progress, discuss common activities and results (e.g. interface design and testing); take decisions on overarching issues. (Project Management and 6 pilot partners with 2 participants each.) |
| O0.5  | Steering Committee Meetings | Align and monitor pilot projects on higher management level; decide escalation cases and provide guidance if necessary. (Project Management and 6 pilot partners with 1 participant each.) |
| O0.6  | UMF Outreach and Coordination | Inform, negotiate with and coordinate cooperation with EU bodies (Council working groups such as DAPIX, standardization partners within the Commission, Presidency etc.) or other partners in standardization (international standards organizations, EU agencies, possible governance partners not involved in the project etc.) (8 visits to Brussels with 1 participant each (Council coordination), 8 visits to other destinations with 2 participants each) |
| O0.7  | Final Conference    | Present project results to wider audience to prepare acceptance and attract further partners; demonstrate pilot project results for possible follow-up projects. |

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable, (e.g. X meetings organised with X participants each)
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s).

### II.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Please list the deliverables produced under this work package. 
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory  
(b) the format could be: printed and/or electronic (downloadable), the approx. number of pages  
(c) please specify each language in which the deliverable will be available  
(d) month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

III. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package:

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0.1</td>
<td>Central Project Management</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0.2</td>
<td>Pilot Project Coordination and Monitoring</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant) supported by pilot project partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0.3</td>
<td>Outreach and Coordination with relevant partners</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), if applicable supported by pilot projects or by individual experts from other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0.4</td>
<td>Dissemination of project results to relevant target groups</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), if applicable supported by pilot projects or by individual experts from other partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work package 1

**Work package: UMF Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in months: 22</th>
<th>Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): DEU (Applicant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### I. Objective(s) of this work package

Develop a new version of the standard UMF based on operational requirements derived from the pilot projects of Workstream 3 (Work packages 3-8).

This requires the definition of suitable requirements, the reaching of an agreement on those requirements and the application of necessary changes in the existing standard UMF (i.e. preparing a "candidate" version).

In addition pilot projects must be supported and advised in the implementation of the standard.

#### II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

- **A1.1** Collect requirements from pilot projects for development of a new version of the standard UMF
- **A1.2** Analyse, evaluate and agree on requirements
- **A1.3** Develop a new candidate version of the standard UMF based on agreed requirements
- **A1.4** Support pilot projects in the implementation of the standard UMF

#### III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- **Outputs** – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- **Deliverables** – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

#### III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1.1</td>
<td>UMF requirements agreement</td>
<td>In order to ensure acceptance of the new version of the standard an agreement of all partners in this Work package on the requirements is necessary as a basis for changes on the standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1.2</td>
<td>Candidate agreement</td>
<td>After the requirements have been agreed upon the resulting changes shall also be consented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1.3</td>
<td>Focus Meetings</td>
<td>Collect, analyse and evaluate requirements. Develop new candidate. Support pilot projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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O1.4 UMF Requirements Analysis Visits

For specific cases it may become necessary to analyse UMF requirements in-depth with the originating partner, e.g. a MS or an EU or other agency. This may require visiting the partner for on-site analysis and consultations.

(2 trips with 3 participants each.)

Please list outputs produced under this work package:

(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))

(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

### III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>List of agreed UMF requirements</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Pilot project partners; end users in their involved LEA authorities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>New version of the UMF standard</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Pilot project partners (short term); all MS using UMF (long term); End users of new services in all involved LEA authorities</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.

(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.

(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication

(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available

(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable

(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

### IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.1</td>
<td>Collect requirements from pilot projects for development of a new version of the standard UMF</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by all partners of this Work package and by pilot projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>Analyse, evaluate and agree on requirements</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by all partners of this Work package and by pilot projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3</td>
<td>Develop a new candidate version of the standard UMF based on agreed requirements</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant) and Europol, if applicable supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.4</td>
<td>Support pilot projects in the implementation of the standard UMF</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant) and Europol, if applicable supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package 2

Work package: Governance Concept

| Duration in months: 30 | Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): DEU (Applicant) |

I. Objective(s) of this work package

Develop one or more viable Governance models for the continued maintenance and development of the standard UMF and the adequate incorporation of all partners in this process.

This requires the definition of suitable requirements, the reaching of an agreement on those requirements, the analysis of existing standard governance solutions and the development and agreement of possible governance structures.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

A2.1 Collect requirements from all Work package partners for the necessary processes and structures of UMF Governance

A2.2 Analyse, evaluate and agree on requirements

A2.3 Analyse existing governance solutions for the maintenance and development of multinational information exchange standards

A2.4 Develop possible governance structures

A2.5 Negotiate with all relevant partners (including outside the project UMF 3) to ensure acceptance and support for the intended governance structure.

A2.6 Prepare necessary steps for the implementation of UMF Governance.

III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- Outputs – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- Deliverables – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O2.1</td>
<td>Governance requirements agreement</td>
<td>In order to ensure acceptance of the proposed governance structures an agreement of all partners in this Work package on the requirements is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2.2</td>
<td>Governance structure evaluation</td>
<td>After the possible governance structures have been designed on the basis of the requirements they shall be evaluated by all partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Meetings
Collect, analyse and evaluate requirements. Develop and evaluate possible governance structures. (7 meetings with 8 participants each.)

Governance Requirements Analysis Visits
For specific cases it may become necessary to analyse governance requirements or structures in-depth with a relevant partner, e.g. a MS or an EU or other agency. This may require visiting the partner for on-site analysis and consultations. (3 trips with 3 participants each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>List of agreed governance requirements</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>All users of the UMF standard (governance shall insure acceptance and quality of the standard)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Proposal for UMF Governance</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>All users of the UMF standard (governance shall insure acceptance and quality of the standard); consequently also all end users of future UMF based services in all involved LEA authorities</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.
### IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2.1</td>
<td>Collect requirements from all Work package partners for the necessary processes and</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by all partners of this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures of UMF Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.2</td>
<td>Analyse, evaluate and agree on requirements</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by all partners of this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.3</td>
<td>Analyse existing governance solutions for the maintenance and development of multinational information exchange standards</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.4</td>
<td>Develop possible governance structures</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.5</td>
<td>Negotiate with all relevant partners (including outside the project UMF 3) to ensure acceptance and support for the intended governance structure.</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), if applicable supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.6</td>
<td>Prepare necessary steps for the implementation of UMF Governance.</td>
<td>DEU (Applicant), if applicable supported by individual experts from partners in this Work package</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package 3

Work package: Pilot Europol – QUeried Europol SysTem (QUEST)

This work package is Europol's contribution to the UMF 3 programme. It will be carried out largely by Europol using its own internal resources & budget.

| Duration in months: 25 | Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): Europol – European Police Office |

I. Objective(s) of this work package

Expose data from Europol Information System (EIS) as web-service for automated searches from national systems enabling a police officer, working on a single computer, to automatically consult the EIS together with his/her national system, SISII where applicable and preparing for consulting Interpol as well once Interpol is ready process UMF3 structured messages. Europol’s web-service is an important prerequisite for pilot- implementations in Member States.

Despite being mature, requesting information from the EIS is not satisfactory for the majority of Member States. The main reason is that querying the EIS (e.g. checking a name of a person) often requires a separate computer, separate login/password, and the repetition of every search query. The end users (e.g. police officers) do not have the necessary time to repeat each search query several times. They certainly have to launch searches in their national police record system, then retyping the same search arguments to consult the Europol/EIS and finally do the same again if they need to query additional systems, such as Interpol/ASF, SIS II, etc. In case they had to use different computers, this procedure is even more laborious. It is also cumbersome to compare data having them on different screens and in a different structure. The pressure and error risk increases when a search turns out to be positive with similar results to be validated before an action can be taken. Another big issue is the 'coverage' of the Europol network in Member States which varies from MS to MS and is usually not sufficient.

The aim of the initiative is to offer a solution (Search Web Service) enabling a police officer, working on a single computer, to automatically consult the EIS together with national systems. This will lead to an increased usage of the EIS and providing important information to a wider range of users carrying out their daily work (this development would actually be consistent with the SIENA strategy). Following the UMF philosophy, the project may lead to a partnership with INTERPOL providing a joint search web service where the end users (police officers) would finally consult all relevant major databases in go. The results will be structured as the requests to the systems will be, clearly indicating the origin of each piece of information and respecting all conditions applicable to these different channels/systems.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

A3.1 Preparations/kick-off
A3.2 Requirements gathering
A3.3 Design
A3.4 Development
A3.5 Testing/Validation
A3.6 Deployment
A3.7 Feedback/Enhancements
A3.8 Finalisation & provision of documentation
### III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively **intangible and tangible** results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- **Outputs** – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- **Deliverables** – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

### III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O3.1</td>
<td>7 project meetings and 1 plenary</td>
<td>Quite some work can be carried out by electronic means (emails, phone, web pages, etc). However, once it comes to more complex matters, face to face discussions will certainly help to achieve the goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

### III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>Search Web Service</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Frontline police officers in Member States</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Documentation facilitating</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>IT developers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3.1</td>
<td><strong>Preparations/kick-off</strong> - 1 meeting with all participants of the pilot (one business + one IT expert)</td>
<td>Europol together with participating Member States developing pilot projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.2</td>
<td><strong>Requirements gathering</strong> – 3 meetings with business and 1 meeting with business and IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.3</td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.4</td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.5</td>
<td><strong>Testing/Validation</strong> - 1 meeting with business and IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.6</td>
<td><strong>Deployment/Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.7</td>
<td><strong>Finalisation &amp; provision of documentation</strong> – 1 meeting with business and IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.8</td>
<td><strong>Feedback/enhancements</strong> – 1 plenary meeting with ALL UMF3 participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work package 4

### Work package: Pilot Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in months: 22</th>
<th>Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): National Police Headquarters Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### I. Objective(s) of this work package

The objectives of the Polish pilot co-project are:

1) to use the UMF standard for law enforcement information exchange and particularly to enable searches within Europol's EIS from the level of the national database,

2) to define technical and legal requirements for UMF information exchange between EIS (authorised to process classified information) and the Polish National System of Police Information (KSIP, authorised only for processing non-classified information),

3) to implement needed changes to existing police infrastructure and applications to allow Police officers query information from the EIS,

4) test the application and go live

An authorised Police officer, after entering the application, will be able to search given data within one activity in the national system and in Europol’s EIS. This will save time and limit the risk of mistakes because search data will not have to be entered more than once. The result of the searches will be presented to a Police officer as a list on his/her screen. This list will show hits or no-hits from all consulted databases (on the condition, he/she has access rights to those databases) to be processed further. The data exchange between systems will make use of a structured and commonly agreed UMF format. Access control will be facilitated by logon and logoff procedures.

Expected advantages:

- Time saving and limiting the probability of mistakes.
- Increasing the volume of searches within EIS and as a result generating more hits.
- Using this application by all Police officers will increase acceptance and efficiency.

### II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

#### A4.1 Project plan and preparation

- Project plan and detailed project charter
  - Project scope, schedules (tasks, durations -> work breakdown structure)
- Resources
  - Work load, necessary resources for each activity (tasks)
- Risk list
- Preparation of the procurement of a server required for the development, tests and operation

#### A4.2 Analysis

(legal and functional analysis concerning the interconnection)

#### A4.3 Design

- Project's business and functional requirements
- Security requirements
- Designing requirements (architectural)
- Test plan

A4.4 Development
- Following the project plan, monitoring the project and risks
- Developing and implementing the designed application (technical)
- Planning the maintenance (also documentation for maintenance)

A4.5 Testing
- System, user acceptance, integration, security, regression and performance testing

A4.6 Go live (includes training)
- Training both end-users and maintenance staff

III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.
Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- Outputs - conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- Deliverables - manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O4.1</td>
<td>Promotion of the UMF 3 standard to management and police officers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4.2</td>
<td>Expert meetings to clarify technical requirements and organise tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Project plan paper</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Polish Police</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Analysis paper</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Polish Police</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Functional and technical requirements paper</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Polish Police</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>Modified query application software</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Polish Police</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.5</td>
<td>Test plans and documentation</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Polish Police</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.
## IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A4.1</td>
<td>Project plan</td>
<td>National Police HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.2</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>National Police HQ, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>National Police HQ, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.4</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>National Police HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.5</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>National Police HQ, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4.6</td>
<td>Go live</td>
<td>National Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Work package: Pilot Estonia – KAIRI UMF Services

| Duration in months: 14 | Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): Estonian Police and Border Guard Board (EPBGB) |

I. Objective(s) of this work package

Connecting the Estonian Police and Border Guard Board national information system (KAIRI) to EUROPOL web services as soon as EUROPOL provides this functionality. All data exchange will be in UMF format in order to achieve interoperability. Module access will be regulated by user rights.

Enhancing and improving the existing procedures the new module will allow end users make queries to national services and Europol web services from a single web application form.

It will make internal and external information easier accessible to field officers by using one service. Querying the national KAIRI system and international systems in one go shall increase the number of searches as well as the potential hits. It will also minimize separate queries to Europol currently causing double input of search data. As a consequence, the workload of law enforcement officers will decrease, whereas the quality and efficiency will increase.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

A5.1 ANALYSIS (Analysis of the functional and technical requirements)

A5.2 SWSPECS (Software specification according to the requirements)
Design of the UMF Web Application Form which will connect to the UMF interfaces in order to query Europol’s databases. Design of the UMF converter. The layer between UMF web services and national database for data translation. Design of the Service for the integration in the National System.

A5.3 DEVLP (Software development)
Development of the UMF converter and an UMF Web Application Form. Authentication and authorisation mechanisms when accessing Europol’s search service.
Development of the Service for the integration in the National System for disseminating the information received from Europol when conducting searches through the UMF Web Application Form.

A5.4 TESTINT (Software testing)
Implementation and configuration in the test environment.

A5.5 TESTEP (Testing with Europol)

A5.6 SWDOC (Documentation)

A5.7 TRAINING (Training)
Produce a user manual and train the supervise users based on a common “train the trainer” concept.

A5.8 ROLLOUT (Rollout and post production support)
### III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively **intangible and tangible** results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- **Outputs** – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- **Deliverables** – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

#### III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O5.1</td>
<td>1 Training of 35 Supervise Users lasting 2 days (train the trainer concept).</td>
<td>Supervise users are responsible for further training all End Users and their support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

#### III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>UMF Web Application Form</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>Competent Authorities (Police and Border Guard Board; Tax and Customs Board)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>User Manual (Working Paper)</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>Competent Authorities (Police and Border Guard Board; Tax and Customs Board)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

### IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5.1</td>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.2</td>
<td>SWSPECS</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.3</td>
<td>DEVLP</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.4</td>
<td>TESTINT</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.5</td>
<td>TESTEP</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.6</td>
<td>SWDOC</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.7</td>
<td>TRAING</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.8</td>
<td>ROLLOUT</td>
<td>Estonian EPBGB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Work package: Pilot Spain

| Duration in months: 14 | Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): Spanish National Police Force (CNP) |

I. Objective(s) of this work package

The aim of this Pilot Project is to enable the Spanish National System to retrieve information in a common data format (UMF) from the Spanish national sources and from Europol seamlessly and efficiently. The ultimate goal is to stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategic preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order in Spain supported by up-to-date IT means.

A Spanish query application will be developed which can consult national and Europol databases (EIS) at the same time. In addition, the new application will provide the basis to query Interpol's database once Interpol is ready to process structured requests applying the UMF3 definitions. The achieved solution will interconnect to Europol and prepare the access to Interpol databases with the national Spanish police systems in such a way, that an investigator, analyst or criminal intelligence officer can search all the mentioned systems in “one go”. This approach will definitely help to close information gaps and to decrease the space in which criminals can operate.

Developing interoperability of national systems with international police data repositories will be extremely valuable in order to facilitate the daily police work in Spain offering possibilities to discover international criminal links without any additional effort as well as this project will make Europol’s EIS as easily accessible to Law Enforcement Authorities in Spain as it is the access to national systems.

According to the new Key Performance Indicators (including figures on searches) agreed by Europol and Member States for the statistics on the EIS, a Europol service will provide the framework to increase the number of searches in Europol’s EIS by relevant law enforcement investigations, further improve information exchange mechanisms and finally enhance and improve cross-border police cooperation.

The so called “one-stop shop principle” will enable users to send data queries to the national systems and to more than one partner system at the same time, there being processed simultaneously and results returned in a structured format. This will not only avoid multiple data input of same data, but also minimising the risk of errors, speeding up procedures and finally contribute to user satisfaction.

User access control to either of the systems will be administered and controlled at national level.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

A6.1 ANALYSE CONNECTIVITY: Study the options and configure the connectivity to Europol’s EIS and study Interpol’s I-24/7 network specifications in order to be prepared in the future when Interpol is ready to receive requests based on the UMF3 standard definitions.

A6.2 DEFCLIENT: Definition and analysis of the Client UMF3 Search Web Service, based on the documents provided by Europol and Interpol on the USE and FIND web services of their respective test environments.

A6.3 DEFNAT: Definition and analysis of the Web Service for the integration with the National System for the dissemination at a national level of the information received after conducting searches on persons in Europol’s and later in Interpol’s databases.

A6.4 DESIGNINTL: Design of the Client Web Service which will connect to the USE and FIND UMF interfaces in order to query Europol’s system and in the future Interpol’s databases.

A6.5 DESIGNNAT: Design of the Web Service for the integration with the National System.
A6.6  DEVELOPCLIENT: Development of the Client Web Service:
- Authentication and authorisation mechanism to access Europol’s search service and accessing Interpol’s search service at a later point of time.
- Search of persons (family name, first name and/or date of birth) in Europol’s databases and later in Interpol’s databases.
- Search of persons (pagination)
- Search of persons (sorting)

A6.7  DEVELOPNAT: Development of the Web Service for the integration in the National System for disseminating the information received from Europol and in the future from Interpol when conducting searches through the Client Web Service developed in the previous task/activity.

A6.8  IMPLTEST: Implementation and configuration in the Test Environment.


A6.10  IMPLPROD: Implementation and configuration in the Production Environment.

A6.11  POSTPROD: Post-production support

A6.12  DOCU: Documentation
- System Analysis Manual
- System Design Manual
- Implementation Manual
- Client Web Service Manual
- Web Service for the integration with the National System Manual

III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
- Outputs – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- Deliverables – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O6.1</td>
<td>Extend the specific knowledge about UMF and standards to be followed. Disseminate the concept further to relevant colleagues within the Spanish police.</td>
<td>The knowledge and experience gained will help educate and train specialised units when it comes to the implementation and use of UMF during the project and later.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>Client Web Service software</td>
<td>Web-tool</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>System Analysis Manual</td>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>System Design Manual</td>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.4</td>
<td>Implementation Manual</td>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.5</td>
<td>Client Web Service Manual</td>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.6</td>
<td>Web Service for the integration with the Web-tool</td>
<td>Printed</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>CNP</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6.1</td>
<td>ANALYSE CONNECTIVITY</td>
<td>CNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.2</td>
<td>DEFCLIENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.3</td>
<td>DEFNAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.4</td>
<td>DESINGNINTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.5</td>
<td>DESIGNNAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.6</td>
<td>DEVELOPCLIENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.7</td>
<td>DEVELOPNAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.8</td>
<td>IMPLTEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.9</td>
<td>TESTINT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.10</td>
<td>IMPLPROD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.11</td>
<td>POSTPROD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.12</td>
<td>DOCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 12 activities are performed by the Spanish National Police Force and partners where applicable.
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#### Work package: Pilot Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in months: 18</th>
<th>Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): National Police Board (NPB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### I. Objective(s) of this work package

The objectives of this pilot are;

1) to use the UMF standard for law enforcement information exchange,
2) to define technical requirements for UMF information exchange,
4) implement needed changes to the query application for querying information from Europol and
5) test the implemented application and go live.

The new query application will be multifunctional. When the end-user logs on to the query-system and requests e.g. nominal information of a subject such as the desired last name, the user will get result lists from different national and international databases. This includes the consultation of the national system “Patja”, of the Europol information system, which will be able to process UMF3 compatible requests, and at the same time Interpol and SIS II databases not being supposed to become UMF3 compatible under this UMF3 project. The goal is to retrieve potential hits or no-hits by one single request from various databases depending on the defined user access rights.

For example, if an end-user has user access rights to Europol and SIS II and not to Interpol, the result list will show only relevant information from Europol and SIS II.

As one of the outcome among others advantages we expect to increase the amount of queries. This will be facilitated by simplifying the application for the end-users and helping them to get all relevant information via one single query system (one-stop shop principle). This will avoid double or multiple data input at the end-users side, consequently increasing data quality and speed. As already outlined, the end user's access rights to different IT systems are checked automatically when a user logs on to the system.

We expect to:

a) improve law enforcement information exchange when using the UMF standard,
b) improve our national query application when using the UMF standard,
c) increase end-user satisfaction when offering the “one-stop shop principle”,
d) increase the volume of queries and quality of work.

#### II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A7.1 Initiation and preparation (possible procurement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project plan and detailed project charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project scope, schedules (tasks, durations -&gt; work breakdown structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Work load, necessary resources for each activity (tasks)
  - Detailed budget plan
  - Risk list
  - Planning procurement

A7.2 Requirements and design
  - Project’s business and functional requirements
  - Security requirements
  - Designing requirements (architectural)
  - Test plan

A7.3 Development
  - Following the project plan, monitoring the project and risks
  - Implementing the designed application
  - Planning the maintenance (also documentation for maintenance)

A7.4 Testing
  - System, user acceptance, integration, security, regression and performance testing

A7.5 Go live (includes training)
  - Training both end-users and maintenance

III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.

Examples of outputs and deliverables:
  - Outputs – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
  - Deliverables – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O7.1</td>
<td>Increased knowledge of UMF standard</td>
<td>Better use of UMF standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7.2</td>
<td>Planning and process knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7.3</td>
<td>Project meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7.4</td>
<td>Requirement Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language (c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>Project Plan</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>NPB</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Functional and technical design</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>NPB</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Development documentation</td>
<td>electronic</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>NPB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer / brochure / working paper / article / press release / slides / CD), website / web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

### IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7.1</td>
<td>Initiation and preparation</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.2</td>
<td>Requirements and design</td>
<td>National Police Board, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.3</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.4</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>National Police Board, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.5</td>
<td>go live</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7.1</td>
<td>Initiation and preparation</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.2</td>
<td>Requirements and design</td>
<td>National Police Board, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.3</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.4</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>National Police Board, Europol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7.5</td>
<td>go live</td>
<td>National Police Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Work package: Pilot Greece – Common Interface Search Environment (CISE)

[Give a name to your work package and keep the same numbering you use in the Budget Estimate]

Duration in months: 18

Name of the Applicant/Co-applicant leading this work package (if applicable): Hellas (H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate)

I. Objective(s) of this work package

A common environment for the search of objects identified by a) Name, b) Surname, c) Date of Birth both in the national environment (Crime Report Database) and relevant Europol and Interpol databases, exploiting the UMF2 data format and structure in order to unify the search methods and data structures exchanged.

The objectives of this initiative are:

1) Common technology used in all different kind of search requests
2) Similar data structures following the UMF standard
3) Interoperability
4) Unified search engine paradigm allowing for faster responses during law enforcement agents duties

II. Description of the work (activities)

Please present a concise overview of the work in this work package in terms of planned activities to achieve the objectives of this work package. Please be specific, give a short name for each activity and number them (the same activities will have to be reproduced in the section IV).

A8.1 Initiation, first analysis and preparation
A8.2 Further analysis, definition of requirements and design
A8.3 Setup a test environment for development
A8.4 Development of National System Crime Reports Database adapter to UMF
A8.5 Development of Web service interface to allow the search of the National System Crime Report Database
A8.6 Development of Web service interface to allow the search of the Europol databases
A8.7 Development of an appropriate web application that will exploit the aforementioned web services (A8.5, A8.6) in one common working environment
A8.8 Establish the interconnection of the national (client) side of the (web) service to the central (server side) at Europol premises
A8.9 Testing and central operator training
A8.10 Setup operational environment hosting the A8.5, A8.6, A8.7 services
A8.11 Test on operational environment and further training of users

III. Results (outputs and deliverables)

Outputs and deliverables are respectively intangible and tangible results of the planned activities. Limit the number of outputs and deliverables, do not include minor sub-items or internal working papers. Technical progress reports, interim reports or final
reports should not be included in the list of deliverables/outputs.
Examples of outputs and deliverables:

- **Outputs** – conferences, seminars, trainings, events, knowledge
- **Deliverables** – manual, leaflet, DVD, research papers, website

### III.a. Output(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output No.</th>
<th>Output (a)</th>
<th>Explanation (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O8.1</td>
<td>Training of personnel supporting the development, set up and maintenance of the environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8.2</td>
<td>End user training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list outputs produced under this work package:
(a) be specific as to the scope and level of ambition, therefore use a quantitative description where applicable (e.g. X regional seminars organised with X participants each, X hours of training (who was trained, where))
(b) please add here additional information which would help the evaluator to understand the characteristics/scope/level of ambition of the output(s)

### III.b. Deliverable(s) of this work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable No.</th>
<th>Deliverable name/type (a)</th>
<th>Format (b)</th>
<th>Language(c)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (d)</th>
<th>Months of implementation (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D8.1.</td>
<td>A 24x7 Web application (service) implementing the Common Interface Search Environment (CISE)</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>Long term support of law enforcement agents work</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2.</td>
<td>Hardware Supporting CISE</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long term support of law enforcement agents work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3.</td>
<td>Consulting Services</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>Education of developers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.4.</td>
<td>End User manual</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Long term education of end users</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.5.</td>
<td>System documentation</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>Greek, English</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the deliverables produced under this work package.
(a) the type/name of deliverable should be self-explanatory and could be: a publication (flyer/brochure/working paper/article/press release/ slides/ CD), website/ web-tool, etc.
(b) indicate the format (printed / electronic), the approximate number of pages and copies of a publication
(c) specify each language in which the deliverable will be available
(d) indicate the specific short / medium / long term beneficiaries for each deliverable
(e) specify the month in which the deliverables will be actually completed. Month 1 marks the start of the project, and all deadlines should be relative to this starting date.

### IV. Distribution of activities to each Applicant/Co-applicant in this work package

Establish a clear list of the activities described above indicating which activity is performed by which Applicant/Co-applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity No.</th>
<th>Name of the activity</th>
<th>Applicant/Co-applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8.1</td>
<td>Initiation and preparation</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate/ Europol / DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.2</td>
<td>Further analysis, definition of requirements and design</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate/ Europol / DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.3</td>
<td>Setup a test environment for development</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.4</td>
<td>Development of National System Crime Reports</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.5</strong></td>
<td>Development of Web service interface to allow the search of the National System Crime Report Database</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.6</strong></td>
<td>Development of Web service interface to allow the search of the Europol databases</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.7</strong></td>
<td>Development of an appropriate web application that will exploit the aforementioned web services (A8.5, A8.6) in one common working environment</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.8</strong></td>
<td>Establish the interconnection of the national (client) side of the (web) service to the central (server side) at Europol premises</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate/ Europol / DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.9</strong></td>
<td>Testing and central operator training</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate/ Europol / DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.10</strong></td>
<td>Setup operational environment hosting the A8.5, A8.6 services</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A8.11</strong></td>
<td>Test on operational environment and further training of users</td>
<td>H.P.H.Q. Informatics Directorate/ Europol / DEU (Applicant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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