



Best Practice replicability framework

Deliverable 3.1

Author(s):
João Gomes
Date:
January 2026

Dissemination level		
PU	Public	X
SEN	Sensitive	

Document control sheet

Deliverable number	D3.1
Deliverable responsible	IPS_Innovative Prison Systems
Work package	3
Main editor	João Gomes (IPS)
Contributors	Carolina Nogueira (IPS); Charline Barreira (IPS)
Reviewer	All partners
Dissemination level	PU – Public
Date	January 2026

Document revision history			
Modifications introduced			
Version	Date	Reason	Editor
1.0	01/2026	Shared consolidated version	João Gomes (IPS)
1.1	01/2026	Shared final version	João Gomes (IPS)

Disclaimer

This report was prepared as an account of work co-funded by the European Commission. The contents of this document are provided “AS IS”, and no guarantee or warranty is provided that the information is fit for particular purposes.

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

Copyright notice

© 2024 – 2026 FULL-PROOF Consortium

Contents

Executive summary	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Preliminary considerations	6
3. Identification and indexation of practices	8
3.1. Directive (EU) 2012/13	9
3.2. Directive (EU) 2013/48	10
3.3. Directive (EU) 2016/1919	11
4. Assessment of practices	12
4.1. Results from the Roundtables	13
4.1.1. Directive 2012/13/EU – Right to Information	13
4.1.2. Directive 2013/48/EU – Right of Access to a Lawyer	13
4.1.3. Directive 2016/1919/EU – Right to Legal Aid	14
5. Replicability and impact matrix	15
5.1.1. Example	17
6. Conclusions	24
Annexes	27
Annexe I: List of identified practices	27
Annexe II: Full analysis of the practices	61

Abbreviations and acronyms

CA	Consortium Agreement
D	Deliverable
DoA	Description of Action
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
GA	Grant Agreement
G.A	General Assembly
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
KO	Kick-off
LEAs	Law Enforcement Agencies
M	Month
PC	Project Coordinator
PO	Project Officer
R&D	Research and Development
RFI	Request For Information
RP	Reporting Period
T	Task
TOC	Table of Content
TRL	Technology Readiness Levels
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader

Executive summary

The FULL-PROOF “Ensuring the due course of criminal proceedings via strengthened respect for the procedural rights of the suspect and accused” is an EU co-funded project which aims to contribute to the streamlining of criminal justice procedures by comprehensively addressing breaches of procedural rights occurring in the initial stages of justice proceedings, concretely those enshrined in Directive 2012/13/EU, Directive 2013/48/EU and Directive 2016/1919/EU. For this purpose, the partnership will work with police officers and lawyers in way of comprehensively raising awareness and knowledge to better approach and work with suspects and accused.

Consortium

IPS_Innovative Prison Systems	Portugal
Polish Platform for Homeland Security	Poland
Alma Mater Studiorum - Universita Di Bologna	Italy
Bulgarian Helsinki Committee Association	Bulgaria
Academia De Politie Alexandru Ioan Cuza	Romania
Peace Institute	Slovenia
Academy of the Police Force in Bratislava	Slovakia

The present Deliverable (D), embedded in Task (T) 3.1.1 – Development of framework – included in Work Package (WP) 3 – Supporting materials and replication of best practices – aims to, on the one, index good and promising practices developed and applied in the field of the protection of procedural rights and assess their potential for replicability for replication in Member States.

The document is structured as follows:

- Pages 1 – X: Introduction and preliminary considerations
- Pages XX – XX: Practice identification and indexation;
- Pages XX – XX: replicability assessment;
- Pages XX – XX: Conclusions;
- Pages XX : annexes.

1. Introduction

The present Document aims to: 1) index good and promising practices developed and applied in the field of the protection of procedural rights in criminal proceedings – concretely those under the scope of Directive 2012/13/EU, Directive 2013/48/EU and Directive 2016/1919/EU, and 2) assess their potential for replicability for replication in Member States. The development of this document was broadly divided into 2 phases. After an initial 1st draft, the framework was analysed throughout 7 roundtables organised in the partnership countries (as part of T3.1.2 - National roundtables on best practices replicability). The feedback gathered was used to finetune the document and create the replicability and impact matrix.

2. Preliminary considerations

When developing a document outlining 'best' practices and assessing the potential for their replicability across EU Member States, especially in the criminal justice field, a number of considerations are important.

Each Member State has a specific legal system, tradition and procedures, including the division of roles across its professionals – Law Enforcement Agencies (LEAs), Prosecutors and Judges. Simultaneously, each Member State has different infrastructures and equipment (i.e., IT systems, funding). As such, the potential replicability of a practice in a certain Member State is naturally dependant on the actor responsible for applying this practice. The fulcrum of the FULL-PROOF Project is the initial stages of criminal proceedings, where a non-negligible number of procedural rights violations occur. As such, the developers of this document have strived to maintain the focus on the potential for the replicability of practices which are aimed to minimise the number of breaches at these stages and that may have a positive effect on professional practices.

The second observation pertains to the use of term 'best practice'. Best practices necessarily involve a careful and constantly monitored implementation process, before being considered as such. As the European Centre for the Development of

Vocational Training (CEDEFOP) outlines, “(...) there is still little clarity on what constitutes a best/good practice. ‘Best’ practices can suggest a judgement but, as a minimum, they carry the implicit understanding that there is an assessment framework (such as a set of criteria and indicators) against which a given practice can be considered among the best.” (CEDEFOP, 2020, 135).

Given the abovementioned considerations on the complexities of applying practices in a criminal justice context, for the purposes of the document, a better use of terminology would be to consider the practices as ‘good’ or ‘promising’ practices, as this better reflects the analysis carried out of these practices, while recognising the necessary need to further apply these practices to know their results.

As such, it is recommended to see this document as a working document with an exploratory scope in mind. Efforts were made to ensure that each section – and the rationale of the framework itself – is carefully contextualised.

3. Identification and indexation of practices

The starting point of activity was a research phase. This phase consisted of desk and field research. Concerning the former, practices were identified and retrieved from:

- 1) Academic literature;
- 2) Institutional reports;
- 3) Results / resources from previous EU-funded projects;
- 4) Others resources.

Practices identified in the field research were done so in the context of the interviews carried out in T2.2.2, as a section of the interviews was dedicated to the identification of 'best' practices.

To facilitate the reading of the framework, the full list of identified practices is available in annexe I of this document.

After the research phase, all identified practices were analysed and placed in a filtering process. In this process, three filters were applied. The **first** one should be highlighted, as it meant a direct exclusion of information. As can be seen in annexe I, some of the practices identified are not, in themselves, practices, but rather **information already outlined in the Directive - that should be transposed by Member States**. As such, these were not included in the indexation¹.

The **second** filter concerned the **deletion of duplicated information**, meaning that, in some cases, if a practice was implemented independently in 2 or more different countries, even if with some differences, these have been grouped as one practice, while outlining the countries in which it was implemented.

Identified practices were divided into 3 groups, each pertaining to each of the Directives (Directive 2012/13/EU, Directive 2013/48/EU and Directive 2016/1919/EU). All identified practices are referenced with a letter and a number (e.g., A1, B4, etc...), the purpose of which is to facilitate Section 3 of the document. Letter 'A' corresponds

¹ On this point see section 6 (Conclusions).

to Directive 2012/13/EU, 'B' with Directive 2013/48/EU and 'C' with Directive 2016/1919/EU Recommendations are referenced as AR1, CR2, etc.

After the identification and filtering process was concluded, 36 practices remained. The pages below showcase the practices remaining after the application of these filters. This information is divided into: 1) Reference (according to the abovementioned indication); 2) Brief description of the practice; 3) Country (or countries) where it was identified.

3.1. Directive (EU) 2012/13

N°	Practice	Country
A1	Leaflet summarising suspects' rights and obligations in a simplified and commonly understandable language.	Poland
A2	Oral clarifications from multilingual police officers at the time of an arrest.	Hungary
A3	Multi-disciplinary development of a new Letter of Rights in several languages: colourful pocket-sized leaflet with essential information, day-to-day vocabulary, format A4.	Belgium
A4	Publish translations of the Letter of Rights in 26 languages (including 21 EU languages).	Poland, Slovenia, Germany
A5	Suspects are informed about their rights three times: immediately upon arrest, again upon arrival at the station with a formal reading and signing, and finally, in the presence of a lawyer and before an official interview.	Spain
A6	Twelve different template letters of rights, keyed to different categories of person and/or proceeding.	France, Hungary
A7	Law enforcement officers use an electronic case-handling system to "tick off" which rights they have informed the suspect about, acting as a means of ensuring suspects receive information about their rights.	Denmark
A8	Guiding the police in assisting people with disabilities allows for providing better services to people with intellectual disabilities, ensuring information.	Spain
A9	Educational specialist or psychologist present during questioning.	Bulgaria
A10	Child-friendly template for communication using multiple child-friendly formats and behavioural guidelines for information provision.	Estonia
A11	Graphic booklets in multiple languages to explain juvenile criminal proceedings, multimedia like cartoons.	Malta, Italy

N°	Recommendation
AR1	(In EAW proceedings) Access to the case file should be granted to the suspect or accused and to lawyers in both issuing and executing state and any documents to be examined during the interview or the trial should be made available to the suspect or accused and to his lawyers in both states before and during the interview or trial
AR2	(In EAW proceedings) Providing a Letter of Rights detailing additional rights specific to EAW proceedings

3.2. Directive (EU) 2013/48

N°	Practice	Country
B1	Lawyers can apply for a digital copy or complete copies of the original file, sent to their office to produce complete copies and/or an electronic file using their own technical facilities, which improves full and swift access to case files for defence preparation.	Germany
B2	For persons arrested on an EAW, if they request a particular lawyer from the Issuing MS, law enforcement in the executing state is aware and the consulted is informed.	Austria
B3	Availability of learning materials such as handbooks for lawyers regarding the effective defence of children suspected in criminal proceedings.	Austria and Hungary
B4	Establishment of a free-of-charge defender emergency hotline offering initial legal advice	Austria
B5	Allowing free choice or change of lawyer and exempting beneficiaries from legal fees.	Spain
B6	Lawyers are recognized with greater margins of intervention, allowing them to make requests, comments, and raise objections during police questioning	Bulgaria, Italy, Spain, and Poland
B7	The Bucharest Bar's electronic system for random appointment of legal aid lawyers ensures prompt legal assistance for persons deprived of liberty and an efficient and transparent appointment procedure	Romania
B8	An online platform connects lawyers and suspects or accused persons before their first interview by the police and/or investigative judge	Belgium
B9	Police officers explain to suspects that it is better to exercise the right to be assisted by a lawyer, reassuring them about the financial aspects of legal aid and trying to convince them to seek legal assistance	Belgium
B10	Mandatory permanent education system, requiring lawyers (including legal aid lawyers) to attend a minimum of 18 training hours per year to keep their knowledge current	Finland

B11	Search engines for lawyers, offering filters like area of expertise and language skills to help clients make informed choices	Finland and Lithuania
------------	---	-----------------------

3.3. Directive (EU) 2016/1919

N°	Practice	Country
C1	(In juvenile justice) State appointing a lawyer free of charge even if the child has resources	Estonia
C2	Specialised training or substantial professional experiences for public defenders in juvenile criminal proceedings	Italy
C3	State-funded legal aid coverage offered based on income and property lines and extensive mandatory grounds, including for minors, persons with disabilities, those unable to speak the national language, and persons in pre-trial detention	Lithuania
C4	All children are entitled to entirely free legal aid	Belgium, Lithuania
C5	Providing legal aid before questioning and extending it to European Arrest Warrant proceedings	Cyprus
C6	Offering legal aid before any means assessment and extending it to certain victims	Spain
C7	Training programmes are established for actors involved in criminal proceedings related to this Directive	Italy, Poland, The Netherlands
C8	'Arrest hotline' and a 'stand-by legal counselling service' have been established	Austria
C9	Basic training programs for newly qualified lawyers require specialized criminal law training or experience, along with 5 supervised cases, for legal aid provider registration	The Netherlands
C10	Legal aid providers compile and make public informative lists of lawyers, including expertise, experience, and language skills, available at police stations, courts, and online	Austria, The Netherlands, Lithuania, Germany
N°	Recommendation	
CR1	Implementing rigorous accreditation criteria and selection processes for legal aid lawyers and paralegals is crucial to ensure they possess the necessary education, training, skills, and experience	
CR2	Developing standardised and continuous training programs for legal aid providers is essential. This training should cover advocacy techniques, legal updates, and the specific needs of vulnerable groups like children and women	

4. Assessment of practices

After the identification, analysis, and indexation of practices, the assessment of these practices was carried. The assessment was preceded by the results from the National Roundtables carried out by the Consortium. These events took place between September and November 2025. The goal of the roundtables was to assess, together with lawyers, prosecutors and police officers, the practices identified, as well as their potential for replicability and the potential impact of these practices in their daily work. This assessment could happen via 2 paths:

1. From the list provided in section 3, each partner would choose 6 practices/recommendations. Partners would be free to choose between those listed, however they should avoid practices that are indicated to exist in their countries.
2. Alternatively, **partners could share the full list with participants** and give participants the space to explore and address the practices they prefer (from the list).

In either path, participants would have to answer a set of questions:

1. *What is your general assessment of this practice?*
2. *In your opinion, do you believe this practice can improve the protection of procedural rights?*
 - a. *If yes, explain.*
 - b. *If no, why not?*
3. *Between 1 and 5, with 1 being extremely unlikely and 5 extremely likely, indicate how likely it would be for this practice / recommendation to be implemented.*
 - a. *If below 3, could you explain why?*
4. *Between 1 and 5, with 1 being extremely difficult and 5 extremely easy, please indicate the difficulty level in the implementation of this practice or recommendation.*
 - a. *If below 3, what do you believe would be the main difficulties in implementing it?*
 - b. *If above 3, what would be the steps to implement it?*

5. *Do you know of any further practices which could be implemented?*

4.1. Results from the Roundtables

4.1.1. Directive 2012/13/EU – Right to Information

At this level the majority of professionals focused on practices related to how the provision of information to suspects and accused persons is communicated. Particularly, practices A1, A3, A4 and A10 were particularly highlighted as those with most potential positive impact in proceedings, addressing a need to enhance the clarity, consistency, and accessibility of rights information across jurisdictions. At national levels, Portugal, participants regarded practices A1 and A3 as a “guarantee of ensuring respect for the rights of suspects and accused persons”. In Romania, all the referred practices were rated 5/5 for their potential effectiveness in the national context. In Slovakia, A1, A4 and A10 were considered practices that could be effective. However, A1 was assessed as difficult to implement, with its feasibility dependant on the will of the legislature and the availability of financial resources. In Slovenia, all of these practices were rated as effective. In Bulgaria, practices A1 and A3 were considered as suitable for implementation and received a 5/5 rating for implementation ease. In Italy, practices A1, A3 and A4 were rated 4/5 as “practices that can be applied”, although further clarification was needed on where the translations of the Letter of Rights' would be published.

4.1.2. Directive 2013/48/EU – Right of Access to a Lawyer

Discussions converged on essential aspects of exercising the right of access to a lawyer. In particular, the right of lawyers to access the original case file (B1) was mentioned by nearly all participating countries. In Romania, this practice was assessed as difficult to implement, with its feasibility depending on financial resources and progress in digital transformation. In Slovakia, it was also assessed as difficult to implement and dependant on the same conditions as in Romania. In Slovenia, it was considered “useful but partial”. In Bulgaria, all roundtable participants considered this practice “extremely useful”. Likewise, the practice relating to a mandatory permanent education system, requiring lawyers (including legal aid lawyers) to attend a minimum

of 18 training hours per year to keep their knowledge current (B10) was strongly supported. In Slovakia, this practice was rated 5/5 for applicability and considered easy to implement. In Slovenia, continuous training was considered “highly relevant and feasible”. In Romania, a regulation establishing continuous training for lawyers was approved, so this practice is already implemented. In Bulgaria, the practice was described as “crucial for maintaining lawyers’ knowledge” and considered easily applicable both technically and financially. Another relevant practice identified by the majority of the countries was (B8) an online platform to connect lawyers and suspects or accused persons before their first interview by the police and/or investigative judge. In Romania it was noted that this practice may involve certain challenges and costs. In Slovenia, it was marked as “not yet developed”. In Italy, all participants considered it “very useful”, suggesting that a single integrated platform should be created to centralise the digital tools, preventing proliferation and difficulties for practitioners. In Poland, this platform was seen as an innovative solution, comprising challenges related to cybersecurity, attorney-client privilege and integration with police IT systems, “understood as a promising but resource-intensive investment into digital transformation”.

4.1.3. Directive 2016/1919/EU – Right to Legal Aid

Countries differed more widely in their consideration of legal aid-related practices. Common elements included access to free legal aid for children (C1 and C4), training programmes for actors involved in criminal proceedings related to this Directive (C7) and the availability at police stations, courts, and online of lists of lawyers, including their expertise, experience, and language skills (C10). Regarding C1, it was noted in Romania the CPC requires mandatory legal assistance for suspects or defendants who are minors. In Slovakia, C1, C4 and C7 were rated 5/5 for applicability and for easy implementation. In Poland, the lists of lawyers were considered as “both highly beneficial and practically achievable”. In the Romanian system, similar lists are available, for example <https://cautavocat.ro/>. In Slovenia, the legal aid system (BPP) operates effectively and ensures wide access to justice, as a result, practices C1 and C4 are fully implemented and effective. In Bulgaria, the legal aid system was described as “well structured” with key challenges such as the remuneration of legal

aid lawyers and the lack of a quality-control mechanism for legal aid services. A good practice was identified, the availability of a Regional Consultation Centres in every regional city and practice C10 was rated 5/5 both for applicability and easy implementation. In Italy, C1 was rated 1/5 and seen as “not sustainable from the principle of equality point of view” and C10 was rated 3/5 for applicability and stressed the necessity to “guarantee the right to the physical presence of defence counsel during meetings with the suspect, so as to prevent a telephone service from replacing the defence lawyer’s in-person appearance”.

5. Replicability and impact matrix

After professionals’ assessment of the practices was carried out, a replicability and impact matrix was developed. It was deemed as necessary to showcase this matrix visually, and not only via a simple list. The Matrix has 2 axes, being **Replicability** (easy, Medium and Difficult [to implement]) and **Impact** (low, medium, High), and is framed in a 3x3 graphic, being:



In addition to the feedback from professionals on the practices identified, it was deemed necessary to apply an additional set of criteria, to better finetune the matrix

and create a 'stress test' of the practices. 5 criteria were applied to the Replicability axis. The more the number of criteria applied to a given practice, the harder it is for such a practice to be replicated.

1. **Legislative:** Regulatory change required beyond minimum EU standards (e.g., changing procedural codes to allow active lawyer intervention during police questioning, or to broaden legal-aid eligibility). These changes go beyond the minimum floor in Directives (EU) 2012/13, 2013/48, and 2016/1919, and often raise national-system design issues.
2. **Budgetary implications:** (e.g., 24/7 hotlines; universal free counsel for children regardless of means; expanding legal-aid coverage). Directive (EU) 2016/1919 acknowledges the fiscal sensitivities in striking the scope/eligibility balance.
3. **IT system build or integration:** (e.g., auditable “tick-off” rights modules in police/case systems; e-files for defence; online matching platforms). These typically need procurement, security and data-protection workflows.
4. **Stakeholder complexity:** (e.g., Bars/Judiciaries/Police/Prosecution Services agreeing on random appointment systems; accreditation regimes for legal-aid lawyers): CCBE guidance and quality-assurance toolkits show this usually requires profession-wide rule-setting.
5. **Cross-border coordination:** (especially for EAW cases requiring cooperation between issuing and executing states, or double-defence). The EAW Handbook (2023) and the text of Directive (EU) 2013/48 underscore these coordination demands.

Regarding the Impact axis, 6 criteria were applied. The more criteria apply to a given practice, the more impact it will have:

1. **Timing:** Measures that operate before or at first police questioning, or before detention decisions, are high-impact. This is grounded in Directive (EU) 2013/48/EU and in the ECtHR's *Salduz* case (access to a lawyer from the first interrogation to keep Article 6 rights “practical and effective”).
2. **Coverage:** Practices that touch all suspects or entire categories (e.g., children) or add enforceable audit trails (verification/remedies under Directive [EU] 2012/13/EU) have higher system-level effects.

3. **Compliance:** Measures that document or verify the delivery of rights (e.g., check-off systems) reduce non-compliance in practice. This is based on issues raised by the European Commission and FRA.
4. **Vulnerable groups:** Child-friendly communication, disability-sensitive guidance, and specialised juvenile defence training are high-impact per FRA and Council of Europe child-friendly justice standards.
5. **Quality assurance of defence:** Accreditation standards for legal-aid providers raise defence quality at scale.
6. **EAW safeguards:** Practices that strengthen double defence, transparency of rights, or case-file access in both states directly affects fairness in accelerated EAW timelines. This is based on the EAW Handbook, Article 5 Directive (EU) 2012/13 (EAW provisions) and Article 5 Directive (EU) 2016/1919.

To summarise these sets of criteria, 2 two major trends apply:

- In the case of **replicability**, if a practice mainly relies on templates, translation, guidance or training, then it is considered as easy to apply, while those practices involving changes to national procedures or requiring funding, IT or cross-country workflows are considered as difficult to apply.
- In terms of **impact**, the more a practice can be applied earlier in proceedings, has broader reach, ensures compliance and protection of vulnerable groups, and is pertinent for EAW proceedings, the more impact it has.

5.1.1. Example

As an example, practice **A5** (*Suspects are informed about their rights three times: immediately upon arrest, again upon arrival at the station with a formal reading and signing, and finally, in the presence of a lawyer and before an official interview*) is positioned in the Matrix as **Medium-High** (Medium difficult – High impact). Framing the practice in accordance with the set of criteria above mentioned:

Replicability:

Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low–Medium	Directive 2012/13/EU already requires early information on rights (Arts. 3–4), information on the accusation (Art.

		6), and allows for verification and remedies (Art. 8). A "three touchpoint" (arrest – station read and sign – pre-interview with lawyer present) is largely implementable via secondary rules rather than a full statutory overhaul – hence not "Difficult," but more than a pure template rollout.
2. Budgetary implications	Low–Medium	Costs are mainly training time and document templates/forms (e.g., read and sign), consistent with Art. 9 on training rather than large new entitlements. No sustained 24/7 staffing or large financial commitments are intrinsic to A5.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Can run on paper custody forms and existing logs; IT is optional (though digitisation could help audit). The Directive stresses verification/remedies (Art. 8) but does not require an IT system to achieve this.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Low	A5 is not EAW specific; it does not require coordination between issuing and executing state.
5. Cross-border coordination	Medium	Sustained adherence across police/custody staff and reliable pre interview access to a lawyer require standard operating procedures, monitoring and training. FRA's practice research shows variability and gaps in how suspects are informed, implying non-trivial change management to ensure consistency.

Impact

Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	A5 synchronises rights information at arrest, on station arrival, and immediately pre interview- precisely when decisions to speak or remain silent are made and where the risk of unfairness is greatest. The Directive requires early, practical information (Arts. 3-6), and ECtHR Salduz case underscores that fairness can be irretrievably prejudiced without effective safeguards from the first interrogation
2. Coverage	High	The measure applies to all suspects and standardises practice at scale; 2012/13 sets minimum standards applicable across proceedings and persons, not limited to cross-border cases, supporting broad system reach
3. Compliance	High	The read-and-sign step creates a clear verification trail (aligned with Art. 8 Directive 2012/13), making compliance auditable and improving the practical value of information – areas where FRA observed persistent real-world gaps (unclear/poorly timed information). Repetition plus documentation addresses these gaps directly
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Multiple, structured explanations make it likelier that children and persons with communication/cognitive vulnerabilities actually understand their rights, in line

		with child-friendly justice/safeguards evidence. While A5 is not child-specific, the cadence and the lawyer-present step materially help vulnerable suspects.
5. Defence quality	High	Re-informing in the presence of a lawyer before questioning supports effective assistance and reduces defective waivers-central aims of Directive 2013/48/EU. The Commission's 2019 implementation report flags issues with scope/derogations/waiver in practice; A5's final touchpoint helps ensure any waiver is informed and recorded, strengthening overall fairness.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	A5 is not tailored to EAW; impact here is neutral (though it complements EAW-specific Letters under Art. 5 Directive [EU] 2012/13 2012/13).

Conclusion: Medium-High. On 'Replicability', the 'Medium' classification reflects that successful roll-out of this practice requires specific standard operating procedures, training, and consistent custody-room routines (and coordination with legal aid access) across frontline services (i.e., coordinated operational change but no major new legislation or large ongoing funding). On 'Impact', A5 has a 'High' impact rating because it operationalises core EU safeguards precisely where they matter most – at arrest, at the police station, and immediately before questioning – improving comprehension, creating a verification trail (via read-and-sign), and aligning the final touchpoint with the presence of a lawyer prior to interrogation. This highlights the provision included in Directive (EU) 2012/13 and the early-access guarantees provisioned in Directive (EU) 2013/48.

Margin of change

Finally, depending on specific conditions (usually related to national contexts), a given practice may fluctuate between different levels in the two sets of criteria. For the most part, fluctuations happen in the replicability set of criteria. As an example, concerning A5:

- **Toward Easy:** Jurisdictions that already ensure routine pre-interview, access to a lawyer and use standardised custody documentation (Letters of Rights, signatures), the implementation of this practice would mainly need training + standard operating procedure updates, which would reduce effort in the necessary changes.

- **Toward Difficult:** Where pre-interview lawyer access is not reliably guaranteed or where documentation/monitoring is weak (concerns noted by the Commission and FRA), A5 would require deeper reforms (e.g., duty-lawyer schemes, appointment/notification workflows, audit processes), pushing the effort toward 'Difficult'.

The detailed analysis of all practices is available in annexe II. For the purposes of the current section, in the table the master table with the results of the analysis of all practices can be found.

N°	Replicability	Impact
A1	Easy	High
A2	Difficult	High
A3	Medium	Medium
A4	Easy	High
A5	Medium	High
A6	Medium	Medium
A7	Difficult	High
A8	Medium	High
A9	Difficult	High
A10	Medium	High
A11	Medium	Medium
B1	Difficult	High
B2	Difficult	High
B3	Easy	Low
B4	Difficult	High
B5	Difficult	High
B6	Difficult	High
B7	Difficult	High
B8	Difficult	High
B9	Easy	High
B10	Difficult	High
B11	Difficult	Low
C1	Difficult	High

C2	Medium	High
C3	Difficult	High
C4	Difficult	High
C5	Difficult	High
C6	Difficult	High
C7	Medium	High
C8	Difficult	High
C9	Medium	High
C10	Easy	Low

Visually, the information listed above translated into the following matrix:



From this, a number of key trends and conclusions should be highlighted:

1. **High-impact practices are largely connected to early defence of suspects and accused**, with practices related to ensuring access to a lawyer at the earliest

stages, enabling active participation of the lawyer during police questioning and securing timely access to case materials being placed in the High-impact section of the matrix.

2. At the same time, **the majority of High-impact measures face significant hurdles in implementation.** These are included in the top-right area. Since these practices require changes at the cross-border level (such as double defence in EAW cases), infrastructure reform (namely IT systems), or legislative changes, demand deeper reforms to make them possible. Still in the topic of EAW practices, there is clear margin of progression to increase cross-border coordination between countries with high-levels of cases, and where the application of double defence in the IS and ES, as well as the provision of an EAW-specific LoR, can have higher impact.
3. **There are a number of practices with a High-impact potential which can be easily replicated.** Specifically, this includes A1, A4, AR2 and B9. These largely follow the two vectors inscribed above. As such, Letters of Rights (and specific LoRs in EAW cases) written in plain language and in accessible format, proactive information and encouragement of suspects and accused persons in exercising their right to a lawyer can have a significant impact in the overall respect for the person's rights. This can largely be implemented without legislative changes (or, at least, substantial changes). This is not only based in research, but also highlighted by the National Roundtables. These practices also carry an advantage close to a "best value for money", being that they are less-resource intensive. Any process in replicating practices should start by these. There is also a progressive element to them, since they can raise baseline standards for all cases and potentially promote the further replication of 'medium' and 'difficult' practices.
4. **Verification mechanisms can sustain implemented practices.** Specifically, those practices (A7, B1, B7 and C9) involving set-by-step verifications and compliance review can create impactful changes in systems and further sustain the impact of additional practices, as they may establish traceable records enabling remedies and oversight. Even if only replicating easier to implement practices on this level, their use can already ensure adequate accountability mechanisms without relying on the system-level changes.

5. The **added benefits of replicating practices that directly contribute to the** provision of **rights to vulnerable persons, including children** (A8, A10, A11, C1, C2, C4) (child-friendly formats, specialist presence, adapted guidance), simultaneously showcase their value as of High impact and how much room for improvement Member States still have to ensure that these groups are adequately accounted for as suspects or accused in criminal proceedings. Furthermore, this directly meets essential requirements as set out in Directive (EU) 2016/800², the European Strategy on the Rights of the Child, and the Council of Europe's Child-Friendly Justice guidelines. While these are placed as 'Medium' on the replicability scale, this classification is mostly related to the need for the provision of training and standardisation of operating procedures. Should some of these elements already be in place, depending on the country, these practices can be easier to replicate.

² On procedural safeguards for children who are suspects or accused persons in criminal proceeding.

6. Conclusions

FULL-PROOF aims to create meaningful impact and ensure enhanced procedural rights protection in the early stages of criminal proceedings. For this purpose, a key takeaway from this exercise is that, at this stage of proceedings, there are practices being implemented with high impact potential and not requiring substantial changes to national procedures, nor significant investment. These practices are those located in the High-Impact and Low and Medium difficulty areas:

Low difficulty:

- **A1** – Leaflet summarizing suspects' rights and obligations in a simplified and commonly understandable language;
- **A4** – Publish translations of the Letter of Rights in 26 languages (including 21 EU languages);
- **B9** – Police officers explain to suspects that it is better to exercise the right to be assisted by a lawyer, reassuring them about the financial aspects of legal aid and trying to convince them to seek legal assistance;
- **AR2** – (In EAW proceedings) Providing a Letter of Rights detailing additional rights specific to EAW proceedings;

Medium difficulty:

- **A5** – Suspects are informed about their rights three times: immediately upon arrest, again upon arrival at the station with a formal reading and signing, and finally, in the presence of a lawyer and before an official interview;
- **A8** – Guiding the police in assisting people with disabilities allows for providing better services to people with intellectual disabilities, ensuring information;
- **C2** – Specialised training or substantial professional experiences for public defenders in juvenile criminal proceedings;
- **C7** – Training programmes are established for actors involved in criminal proceedings related to this Directive;
- **C9** – Basic training programs for newly qualified lawyers require specialized criminal law training or experience, along with 5 supervised cases, for legal aid provider registration.

As outlined above, the practices assessed as Medium difficult can easily become 'Easy', with this change being dependent on a set of pre-conditions which may, or may not, already exist in some Member States.

A second takeaway is that practices aimed at ensuring the right of access to a lawyer remain difficult to implement, with only one practice being classified as 'Easy' to implement. To ensure application of other practices, Member States need to employ non-negligible resources, which may require further work and involvement from other governmental authorities.

Thirdly, although most practices are classified as 'Difficult' to implement, the way Member States choose to apply them may not be necessarily hurdled by the constraints outlined in the criteria above. Member States should see the practices, not in a vacuum, but as inextricably linked. It can be argued that implementing the 'easy' practices can create the basis for a sustained uptake of progressively difficult tasks. This ultimately depends, of course, on institutional and professional adherence to the latter practices, to which consideration for legal and operational cultures should be added. For instance, looking into practices A1, A4, B9 and AR2, these can pave the way for:

- Better informing suspects and accused persons (to which we must add vulnerable groups) of their rights – including of the access to a lawyer and/or legal aid;
- Ensuring that the suspects and accused persons are undoubtedly informed on their right of access to a lawyer or legal aid.

Resolving these two issues can mitigate several risks that rights related to the non-communication and provision of rights and thus avoid future nullification of proceedings. Furthermore, it ensures adequate monitoring of compliance by first-line professionals. For EAW proceedings this analysis also highlights the need for increase cooperation and standardisation between Member States. Piloting the use of a common EAW LoR between 2 countries with high levels of cross-border criminal proceedings could be a good starting point on this level.

Lastly, initially, it underlined that, during initial screening of practices, some of those identified merely translated provisions already included in the Directives, and that should be transposed into the legislation of Member States. Indeed, the continuous opening of infringement proceedings by the European Commission in relation to the Stockholm programme Directives means that countries, even if at different levels, remain resistant to fully transpose this legislation. While it is out of the purpose of this document, one of the main conclusions from the National Roundtables is that **the most important practice Member States should implement is the correct transposition of the Directives**. This displays some incongruences, as some countries develop good practices, while simultaneously undergoing infringement proceedings in relation to their criminal procedural law. With the last of the Stockholm programme Directives having been published for approximately 10 years, there is now ample possibility for Member States to ensure that the rights provisioned in these directives are duly respected and protected.

Annexes

Annexe I: List of identified practices

The full list of identified practices is organised by references (i.e., sources). Each table corresponds to one reference (i.e., source). Each reference shows the name of the resource used and includes a brief description. Additionally, each reference can include more than one practice, as well as practices related to different directives.

1	Related Directive(s)	2012/13 and 2013/48	
Source	EUCRIM (2017). EU directives on the rights of suspects		
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country	
Directive 2012/13	Arrested persons are now to be given a letter of rights, which they are allowed to keep throughout the time they are deprived of liberty	FR	
	The obligation to inform suspects about accusations has been made more precise, requiring that the suspect be told the place, the time, and the legal classification of the offense.	FR	
	French legislation gives accused persons access to all materials at the latest when the case is brought before the criminal court for judgment, complying with the minimum standards of the directive for suspects who are not detained.	FR	
Directive 2013/48	French legislation was recently changed to allow a suspect to be assisted by a lawyer from the first interrogation by the police.	FR	

2	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	Italian government — Report on the implementation of Directive 2012/13 on the right to information in criminal proceedings	
Summary	The report evaluates the implementation of Directive 2012/13/EU in Italy on the right to information in criminal proceedings, examining both its legal transposition and practical application through legal analysis and surveys with defence lawyers. It finds that while the legal framework is largely satisfactory, practical implementation remains insufficient, particularly regarding the delivery of the Letter of Rights and the training of judicial staff. Shortcomings in translation and interpretation are also highlighted as major obstacles. The conclusion is that Italy has only partially implemented the directive, requiring further efforts to ensure its effective application.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Communications informing suspects or accused persons of their rights must have a clear and accurate form and be translated into a language that the suspect or accused person understands	IT
	Information about the criminal act suspected or accused of having committed, including its legal classification and the moments when this information is provided	IT
	Suspects and accused persons are usually granted access to material evidence in due time to exercise the rights of the defense	IT

3	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	FRA — Rights of suspected and accused persons across the EU: translation, interpretation, and information	

Summary	The FRA report examines the protection of the rights of suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings across Member States, focusing on Directive 2010/64/EU on the right to interpretation and translation and Directive 2012/13/EU on the right to information. It assesses how national legal frameworks and practices secure access to these rights, highlighting the quality standards of interpretation and translation services and the clarity of information provided. Particular attention is given to vulnerable persons, such as children and persons with disabilities, stressing the need for tailored safeguards to ensure effective and fair participation in judicial processes. The report also offers recommendations and best practices to strengthen these fundamental guarantees.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Using leaflets providing information in non-technical language	N/A
	Drafting a clear and accessible Letter of Rights	N/A
	Drafting a clear and accessible Letter of Rights	N/A
	Guiding police during the interview to ensure information on the accusation is provided	N/A

4	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2016/1919
Source	FRA — Children as suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings	

Summary	The 2022 FRA report examines how nine EU Member States implement safeguards for children in criminal proceedings under Directive 2016/800, based on interviews with professionals and children. It covers rights to information, access to a lawyer, participation, individual assessment, privacy, detention conditions, and professional training. Findings show uneven application, communication barriers, and the need for child-adapted approaches, alongside examples of good practices to strengthen protections. All three directives in your query are addressed.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Child-friendly template for communication using multiple child-friendly formats and behavioural guidelines for information provision (in Letter of Rights for example),	EE
	Graphic booklets in multiple languages to explain juvenile criminal proceedings, multimedia like cartoons	IT
	Educational specialist or psychologist present during questioning	BG
	Methods to verify children's understanding of rights	N/A
	Drawings and age-appropriate means to inform children	MT

	Professionals trained to communicate with children	N/A
Directive 2016/1919	State appointing a lawyer free of charge even if the child has resources	EE
	Specialized training or substantial professional experiences for public defenders in juvenile criminal proceedings	IT

5	Related Directive(s)	2013/48
Source	European Commission — Report on the implementation of Directive 2013/48	
Summary	This European Commission report examines the implementation of Directive 2013/48/EU, which guarantees the right of access to a lawyer and communication with third parties and consular authorities for suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings and EAW cases. It assesses whether EU Member States have correctly transposed the directive into national law, noting achievements but also identifying shortcomings.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2013/48	The provision of means for direct contact with the lawyer, such as a helpline, systems of on-call duty lawyers, lists of lawyers, dedicated websites, search engines, leaflets, and – in the case of one Member State, a chat service	N/A

	Emergency services have been put in place by some Member States to facilitate the appointment of a lawyer for those deprived of liberty	N/A
	Specific safeguards for children, where legislation allows for another appropriate adult, such as an authority for the protection of minors or a guardian ad litem, to be informed if it is contrary to the child's best interests to inform the holder of parental responsibility	N/A

6	Related Directive(s)	2016/1919
Source	European Commission — Report on the Implementation of Directive 2016/1919	
Summary	This European Commission report, published in February 2023, evaluates the implementation of Directive 2016/1919 on legal aid for suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings, as well as for individuals sought under EAW. The report notes that while the directive has improved protection, difficulties remain in national transposition, particularly regarding scope and timely provision of legal aid. The Commission plans further action to ensure full compliance across the EU.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2016/1919	Automatic eligibility to legal aid for vulnerable persons (those with physical or mental incapacities, etc)	N/A

7	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	The European Criminal Law associations' forum, 2020 edition — Improving defence rights	

Summary	This article focuses primarily on EU criminal policy, strengthening the rule of law, and judicial cooperation. They cover topics such as the European Commission's annual rule of law reports, challenges related to judicial independence and media freedom in some Member States, and efforts to combat fraud and organized crime, including money laundering and cybercrime. Discussions also address the digitalization of justice, artificial intelligence, data protection, the need to improve cross-border cooperation mechanisms, and ensuring fundamental rights in criminal proceedings.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	In some MS, public prosecutor's offices in Portugal provide digital copies of the investigative file once an indictment has been pronounced.	PT
	In Germany, lawyers can apply for a digital copy or complete copies of the original file, sent to their office to produce complete copies and/or an electronic file using their own technical facilities, which improves full and swift access to case files for defence preparation	DE

8	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	FRA — Handbook on European law relating to access to justice Rights in practice: access to a lawyer and procedural rights in criminal and the EAW proceedings	
Summary	The FRA report examines the practical application of fundamental procedural rights for suspects or accused persons in eight EU Member States. It highlights challenges related to the right to information and access to a lawyer, both in national criminal proceedings and in the context of EAWs. Based on interviews with over 250 judicial actors and defense practitioners, the report reveals inconsistencies in the implementation of these rights, including difficulties for accused persons in understanding their rights, police discouragement of lawyer presence, and limited access to legal representation, particularly in EAW cases. It emphasizes the importance of the uniform application of these rights to strengthen mutual trust among Member States.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country

Directive 2012/13	PAD system (computer-assisted legal instructions) provides easy-to-understand legal instructions, including information about the accusation and the right to remain silent, and requires defendants to confirm their understanding orally and in writing before questioning.	AT
	Law enforcement officers use an electronic case-handling system to "tick off" which rights they have informed the suspect about, acting as a means of ensuring suspects receive information about their rights.	DK
Directive 2016/1919	For persons arrested on an EAW, if they request a particular lawyer from the Issuing MS, law enforcement in the executing state is aware and the consulted is informed.	AT

9	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	FRA — Handbook on European law relating to access to justice	
Summary	This handbook explores the concept of access to justice in Europe, a fundamental right that underpins other freedoms and enables individuals to defend themselves or seek redress. It highlights key legal principles established by the European Union and the Council of Europe, particularly through the case law of their respective courts. Designed as a practical guide for legal professionals, judges, prosecutors, and lawyers, as well as NGOs, the book covers issues such as the right to a fair trial, legal aid, effective remedies, and potential barriers to access to justice, including procedural delays and costs.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Guiding the police in assisting people with disabilities allows for providing better services to people with intellectual disabilities, ensuring information.	ES

	Promoting access to justice for prisoners with learning disabilities produced an access to justice guidebook in order to support the responsive and appropriate management of adults with learning disabilities in the criminal justice system, which aims to improve service provision.	WL (UK)
--	--	---------

10	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	Tsagkalidis (2017) Directive 2012/13/EU On the Right to Information in Criminal Proceedings	
Summary	The text provides an in-depth overview of Directive 2012/13/EU on the right to information in criminal proceedings. It explains its role within the EU roadmap to strengthen procedural rights and harmonize standards across the MS. The article compares its provisions with ECtHR case law, noting both alignment and added safeguards such as the "letter of rights." It examines the three dimensions of the right to information, being informed of procedural rights, of the charges, and of access to case files, along with verification and remedies. Ultimately, it highlights the directive's aim to ensure fair proceedings and stronger guarantees for suspects and accused persons.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Providing information orally or in writing and in a simple and accessible language to suspects or accused persons regarding their procedural rights	N/A
	Achieving clear information delivery through non-legislative measures such as appropriate training for the competent authorities	N/A
	Drafting a Letter of Rights in simple and non-technical language to be easily understood by a layperson without knowledge of criminal procedural law	N/A

	Taking into account any particular needs of vulnerable suspects (e.g., young age, mental or physical condition) when providing information	N/A
	Providing arrested or detained persons with a Letter of Rights, in a simple and comprehensible language, detailing rights such as access to a lawyer, free legal advice, accusation, interpretation/translation, right to silence, access to case materials, communication with relatives/consular authorities, urgent medical assistance, maximum deprivation of liberty, and challenging the lawfulness of arrest/detention	N/A
	For persons arrested or detained under a European Arrest Warrant, providing a Letter of Rights detailing additional rights specific to EAW proceedings	N/A
	Providing suspects or accused persons with general information about the criminal act they are suspected of, including facts (time/place) and possible legal classification, promptly and in sufficient detail	N/A
	Ensuring access to evidence is granted in "due time" and at the latest upon submission of the merits of the accusation to a court	N/A
	For arrested or detained persons, providing access to documents essential in challenging the lawfulness of their arrest or detention at the latest before a competent judicial authority decides on the lawfulness	N/A

11	Related Directive(s)	All
Source	FAIR project, 2019 - FAIR project, Enhancing the Fair Trial for People Suspected or Accused of Crimes	

Summary	FAIR Best Practice Handbook is a project funded by the EU, developed by a consortium of partners from Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, and Hungary. Its main objective is to develop a multilingual information tool to introduce persons suspected or accused of crime to their procedural rights, thereby enhancing the fair trial for them. The handbook is aimed at criminal justice practitioners like police officers, prosecutors, judges, and lawyers. It provides detailed and up-to-date knowledge about the implementation of six EU directives in the partner countries, alongside an analysis of practical challenges. The "best practices" identified are defined as efficient, well-established procedures or working models that ensure individuals access to a fair trial and their rights, regardless of their background, with a potential for transferability to other MS.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Availability of the Letter of Rights in more than one language (Austria, Greece)	AT, EL
	Availability of an electronic police protocol system which requires that information on the procedure is provided to individuals before an official protocol can be generated.	AT
	Oral clarifications from multilingual police officers at the time of an arrest	HU
	Availability of learning materials such as handbooks for lawyers regarding the effective defence of children suspected in criminal proceedings	HU
	Use of various means to provide access to the materials of the case (the defence may take photographs of the case files or may request a copy by email)	AT, HU

2013/48	Establishment of a free-of-charge defender emergency hotline offering initial legal advice	AT
	Allowing the use of texting and internet-based applications to inform third parties, in order to make notification efforts more effective	HU
	Establishment of an electronic system for lawyers for substituting one another in cases where defence is mandatory, which contributes to resolving the problem of weekend, bank holiday or delayed appointment of defence counsels	HU
2016/1919	Practice of appointing lawyers with adequate experience in criminal law in cases where legal is granted	HU

12	Related Directive(s)	2012/13
Source	ProRPC project, 2023 - Right to information Factsheet	
Summary	A 2023 factsheet from the EU ProRPC project stresses the importance of the right to information in police custody as a gateway to effective defence and protection against ill-treatment. It outlines obligations to inform suspects in clear, accessible language, including through a written Letter of Rights highlighting good practices to this regard. Challenges persist: complex legal language, low literacy, lack of adaptation for vulnerable persons, and limited use of alternative formats.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country

Directive 2012/13	New Generation PAD: provides relevant legal text with a corresponding explanation in simple and accessible language, including information about the defendants' right to defend themselves or to remain silent and not incriminate themselves. It unified all modules for different kinds of police work into one system / It contains not only the relevant information on the legal provisions, but also an explanation in accessible language that police officers need to read out loud to suspects / It includes additional information, links and documents (such as a Letter of Rights) that can be easily accessed by police officers.	AT
	Multi-disciplinary development of a new Letter of Right in plenty of languages: colourful pocket-sized leaflet with essential information, day-to-day vocabulary, format A4, working group comprising various criminal justice stakeholders and experts was created to pilot the alternative Letter of Rights	BE
	Training module to raise awareness among lawyers and judges	BE
	Letter of Rights designed for children with pictograms and easy-to-understand information developed by the Ministry of Justice and Security	NL
	Info package for each step of custody for children	ES
	collaborative development through multidisciplinary and advocate consensus of an accessible notice for people with intellectual disabilities in police custody (two-way explanation, pictures, revised Letter of Rights)	IE

13	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2016/1919
Source	LA CHILD, 2021	
Summary	This project provides guidelines for child-friendly legal aid for children in conflict with the law, recognizing that such defence requires specialized skills beyond those of unprepared volunteer lawyers. It stresses public authorities' duty to ensure quality, free, and accessible legal aid adapted to children's needs. Drawing on research from 14 European countries, it outlines 32 key factors for an effective system, with a focus on secondary legal aid. Themes include legal frameworks, adequate resources, unconditional free aid, continuous representation, access for detained children, limits on waiving assistance, specialized and trained lawyers, interprofessional cooperation, interpretation, confidentiality, free choice and change of lawyer, multidisciplinary support, child-friendly communication, common standards, and monitoring and complaint mechanisms, aiming to strengthen justice access	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	To ensure that children understand it, the information can be given with the help of a child-friendly bill of rights. It should be noted, however, that while child-friendly written material is good practice, information given in writing should always be explained orally.	N/A
	All junior high school students take part in lectures on the Finnish legal system as part of their social studies curriculum	FI
	Belgium's project "Dans la peau de..." aims to raise awareness of and inform children about child justice. Workshops are led in schools that educate students around children's rights in legal proceedings (including access to legal aid) as well as the relevant actors, philosophy, and procedural steps for children in conflict with the law	BE

2016/1919	All children are entitled to entirely free legal aid	BE, LT
-----------	--	--------

14	Related Directive(s)	2013/48, 2016/1919
Source	CRIMILAW project, 2022 - National infosheets On the application of the three procedural rights directives	
Summary	This CrimiLAW project report analyses how Cyprus, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and Spain have implemented the EU directives on access to a lawyer (2013/48/EU), presumption of innocence (2016/343/EU), and legal aid (2016/1919/EU). Overall, legislative alignment varies widely: some countries have introduced significant reforms, particularly for access to a lawyer and legal aid, while others have made minimal changes, often claiming existing laws already meet EU standards. In several cases, transposition was partial or delayed, with important provisions omitted. Even where legal frameworks are in place, practical challenges remain, including uneven application of rights, lack of effective remedies for breaches, procedural delays, and inadequate quality of legal aid. In some countries, full implementation is hindered by political inaction, and the gap between legislation and everyday practice continues to undermine the effectiveness of procedural safeguards.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2013/48	Guaranteeing lawyer access before and during questioning, with private meetings and participation in evidence-gathering	CY
	Ensuring lawyers' assistance in free hearings and across investigative acts, including reconstructions and identifications	FR

	Protecting lawyer-client confidentiality at all stages, with communication possible before questioning	ES
	Extension of procedural including lawyers' assistance, to suspects outside custody through the "suspect libre" (free suspect) status	FR
	Setting mandatory notice periods and delays to allow lawyer preparation	HU
	Guaranteeing the right to inform family or consular authorities immediately after detention	EL
	Making the right to a lawyer non-waivable, with safeguards for any waiver	EL
2016/1919	Courts, prosecuting authorities, and the police should ensure that there are adequate facilities for confidential client-lawyer consultations	N/A
	Reforms introducing a rota for the appointment of lawyers should be monitored. There should be an effective duty lawyer scheme in place to ensure that suspects and accused persons are guaranteed access to impartial legal assistance throughout criminal justice proceedings, especially at the earliest stages	N/A

	Better safeguards to ensure that waivers of the rights are given unequivocally, knowingly, and intelligently	N/A
	Suspects and accused persons who are unable to pay for legal services privately should not be required to pay back the costs of legal aid if they are convicted	N/A
	Legal aid schemes currently in operation should be simplified so that there is greater clarity and certainty for suspects and accused persons who are unable to afford private legal assistance, and to ensure that vulnerable defendants are not discriminated against	N/A

15	Related Directive(s)	All
Source	CROSS-JUSTICE project, 2022 - Cross-Justice, knowledge advisory and capacity building, information tool for criminal procedural rights in judicial cooperation	
Summary	The report is a comparative analysis report from the CROSS-JUSTICE project. It reviews the transposition and application of six EU directives on procedural rights of suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings across eleven Member States. The report identifies common trends, gaps, and challenges in harmonisation, particularly due to the vagueness of the directives, divergent national judicial interpretations, and practical obstacles. It also considers the potential use of artificial intelligence to assess levels of harmonisation and suggests that AI could help accelerate the integration of national legal systems.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Letters of Rights have been created, following more closely the wording of the Directive	IT, NL

	Requires delivering the information rights in an accessible language, adapted to the age, degree of maturity, disability, and any other personal circumstance, to ensure comprehensibility	ES
	The model Letter was partially amended, substituting the right to be informed of the accusation with a more safeguarding direct communication on charges	DE
	Case-law interventions led to necessary statutory amendments to align with the Directive regarding informing the accused of the nature and legal classification of the criminal offence and any relevant changes	BG, IT, FR, PL
	The accused shall not only “understand” but also “master” the language to avoid the need for interpretation and translation	NL
	Domestic jurisprudence considers it sufficient to ask the defendant about their linguistic skills, and in case of doubt, the right to interpretation is recognized	HR
2013/48	Lawyers are recognized with greater margins of intervention, allowing them to make requests, comments, and raise objections during police questioning	BG, IT, ES, PL
	After the accused's initial statement, questions can then be posed directly by the lawyer	HR

2016/1919	Training programmes are established for actors involved in criminal proceedings related to this Directive	IT,PL, NL
-----------	---	-----------

16	Related Directive(s)	All
Source	LEAP project, 2016 - Defense rights in Europe: the road ahead	
Summary	The report, produced by the Legal Experts Advisory Panel and coordinated by Fair Trials, reviews the EU's progress on fair trial rights since 2009, focusing on the adoption of five key directives. It highlights ongoing challenges, including excessive pre-trial detention, plea bargaining, migration-related issues, and evidentiary problems in terrorism cases. The report also sets out LEAP's recommendations to strengthen defence rights and proposes the creation of a European scoreboard to assess Member States' compliance with fair trial standards.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	Improved Letters of Rights, making it easier for individuals to understand their rights	N/A
	Enhanced access to case files	DE, BE
	Ensure access to documents necessary to challenge detention	ES

	A detained person and their lawyer have the right of access to the full case file, without possibility of derogation. Lawyers are generally able to consult and make copies during the investigative stage	RO
	Full unrestricted access with the ability to make copies is provided once the case is transferred to the court, despite initial difficulties	BG
	Lawyers formed an informal group to collaborate on implementation, producing guides for arrested persons and engaging authorities	PL
	LEAP members used the Directive to file a complaint with the Constitutional Court as part of a coordinated effort, including best practice guides	ES
2013/48	The Law Society produced guidance notes and training sessions for lawyers assisting at the police station stage	Scotland (UK)
	Director of Public Prosecutions directed police to allow solicitors to be present at initial interviews	IE

17	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2013/48
Source	Inside Police custody 2 project, 2018 - Inside Police custody 2 Report	

Summary	This document presents the results of a comprehensive study conducted in nine EU MS between 2016 and 2018, assessing the practical implementation of three key directives: the right to interpretation and translation, the right to information, and the right of access to a lawyer for suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings. The report highlights both successes and shortcomings in legislative transposition and practical application, including issues with access to services, quality of provision, and differing interpretations of the rules across countries. It concludes with concrete recommendations to the European Commission, national governments, and professional associations to strengthen the effectiveness of these fundamental safeguards.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	The arrested persons are immediately informed of the reason for arrest and the facts attributed to them, with information on procedural rights provided in writing, in simple and accessible language, and in a language they understand	ES
	The right to information about procedural rights was extended to all detained persons, including a right to interpretation of the information provided, requiring information to be provided both orally and in writing, and providing for a right of access to case materials. A standard letter of rights prepared by the police is available in 22 languages	SI
	A standard 'infosheet' (letter of rights) is available in German and 47 other languages for detained suspects. A computer program for police interviews, introduced in 2018, requires information on rights to be provided before details of the interview can be entered	AT
	Investigators were observed offering suspects the opportunity to ask questions after receiving the letter of rights, and informing suspects of their right to refrain from giving evidence before beginning interrogation. Some interrogators also offered suspects the chance to consult with their lawyers in private before the interrogation	LT
2013/48	The regulation of access to a lawyer was extended to specifically include advice on the consequences of consenting or refusing investigative procedures, and a right to a private consultation with a lawyer before and after interrogation	ES

	The duty lawyer scheme requires lawyers to have been members of the relevant bar association for at least three years, completed a specified course, and passed an assessment, ensuring quality and effectiveness	ES
	No limitations on what a lawyer can do during interrogations. Lawyers reported that their presence generally leads the police to act in a more formal and respectful manner towards the suspect	SI
	An 'arrest hotline' and a 'stand-by legal counselling service' have been established	AT

18	Related Directive(s)	2013/48
Source	ProRPC project, 2023 - Access to a lawyer factsheet	
Summary	This factsheet, produced under the European ProRPC project, examines access to a lawyer for individuals in police custody, stressing its importance for safeguarding other procedural rights and preventing abuse. It highlights persistent challenges in ensuring the effective application of this right across the EU, despite existing directives. The report showcases promising practices from Romania, Spain, and Belgium, such as rapid and transparent systems for appointing duty lawyers. These national examples demonstrate how effective mechanisms can improve the availability and quality of legal assistance, particularly for vulnerable persons. The text concludes with an urgent call for swift lawyer appointment systems, supported by political and legislative will and a shift in police culture, to ensure concrete implementation.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2013/48	Legal representation is mandatory for suspects or accused persons who are a child, deprived of liberty, believed unable to prepare their defense, or during trial for offenses with potential detention for life or imprisonment exceeding 5 years	RO

	The Bucharest Bar's electronic system for random appointment of legal aid lawyers ensures prompt legal assistance for persons deprived of liberty and an efficient and transparent appointment procedure	RO
	The duty system ensures lawyers are on call 24/7 every day of the year to provide in-person legal assistance to suspects in police custody	ES
	An online platform connects lawyers and suspects or accused persons before their first interview by the police and/or investigative judge	BE
	The system is randomized, ensuring the police have no power to decide which lawyer will be called	BE
	The platform serves as an effective tool for data collection, tracking steps taken by the police to find a lawyer, and evaluating implementation	BE
2016/1919	If no lawyer is found through the application, an emergency number at the legal aid office level can always be called	BE
	Adult suspects can be put in contact with duty-scheme staff for a free consultation if a lawyer does not come after two hours	BE

19	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2013/48
Source	ProRPC project, 2023 - Legal aid factsheet	
Summary	This factsheet, produced with EU financial support under the ProRPC project, addresses legal aid and the strengthening of procedural rights in police custody. It underscores the importance of legal aid during criminal investigations, identifying challenges and promising practices across the EU, with a focus on Austria, Ireland, Spain, and Romania. The text also provides key definitions of legal aid and reviews the international and European standards governing this fundamental right. It highlights persistent regional challenges such as underfunding and uneven service quality, while showcasing good practices like Spain's system and innovative approaches in the Netherlands and Finland.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
Directive 2012/13	The national legal aid chat service provides general advice on legal matters in Finnish, Swedish, and English, making information widely accessible	FI
	All suspects and accused persons can receive free preliminary information over the phone through an arrest hotline	AT
2013/48	Compulsory assistance of a lawyer from the moment of police detention, which practically ensures access to legal aid for any person in police custody. This right can only be waived in certain cases of road safety offenses	ES
	Regardless of the final outcome of a means test, all detainees who request legal aid are assisted by a duty lawyer during their stay in the police station in Spain, as access to legal counseling in detention is mandatory	ES

	he appointed lawyer in Spain must arrive at the police station as soon as possible, always within a maximum period of three hours from receiving the assignment	ES
	A rota scheme ensures the availability of lawyers on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year round, to provide in-person legal assistance to suspects in police custody	ES
	n the interest of consistency, the same lawyer who assisted the suspect or accused person at the police station should, in principle, follow the entire judicial proceedings	ES

20	Related Directive(s)	All
Source	ProRPC, 2023 - Strategically strengthening procedural rights: challenges, opportunities, lessons learned	
Summary	The report examines how to strengthen procedural rights in police custody. It highlights the persistent gap between legal reforms and their practical application, stressing the need for a systemic approach that looks at the processes driving change rather than only the content of reforms. The report identifies key drivers such as stakeholder engagement and a clear long-term vision, and it outlines practical methods including research, advocacy, strategic litigation, and training to improve the rights of suspects and accused persons.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
2012/13	Redrafting the letter of rights handed out to suspected persons in police custody in plain language, a process initiated by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and finalized by a working group including lawyers, judges, federal and local police, and representatives from the Ministry of Justice	BE

2013/48	An online platform is used to connect lawyers and suspected persons before the first interview by the police, an initiative that stemmed from Bar Associations collaborating with a developer	BE
	Police officers explain to suspects that it is better to exercise the right to be assisted by a lawyer, reassuring them about the financial aspects of legal aid and trying to convince them to seek legal assistance	BE
	Police sometimes contact judicial authorities to consider vulnerable persons who waive their rights as vulnerable persons, when they do not seem to understand the consequences of waiving their rights	BE
2016/1919	The Netherlands Bar supported legal aid lawyers opposing government plans for cuts on compensation, leading to the allocation of a budget for the legal aid system	NL
	The legal aid system in Romania was changed due to pressure from legal aid lawyers of the Bucharest Bar to make the random appointment system fairer in terms of distribution of cases	RO

21	Related Directive(s)	All
Source	"Piloting Equality data collection in criminal justice systems across the EU" project, 2022 - Problems with the equal treatment of accused persons in pre-trial proceedings in Bulgaria	
Summary	This comparative report reviews the right to a lawyer and legal aid in criminal proceedings in Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, and Slovenia, with a focus on the implementation of EU Directives 2013/48 and 2016/1919. It outlines national legal frameworks, access points for legal assistance, and challenges such as restrictive definitions of "suspect" or "accused." The study also examines issues of lawyer-client confidentiality, notification of third parties when someone is deprived of liberty, and the rules on derogations and waivers. It highlights gaps between legal provisions and practice and concludes with recommendations for legislative and procedural reforms to improve the quality and effectiveness of legal aid.	

Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
2012/13	The Minister of Justice is obliged to prepare instruction forms ("letters of rights") in the form of decrees to inform arrested persons and suspects of their rights	PL
	Suspects and accused persons deprived of liberty are immediately informed of their rights, including the right to legal assistance and state-appointed lawyers if indigent. Police officers facilitate detainees' first contact with a lawyer by making the phone call	SI
	Information on procedural rights must be served to suspects in writing prior to their first questioning, along with a notification of suspicions, in a letter of rights approved by the Prosecutor General	LT
	Police officers should be able to provide a list of duty legal aid lawyers, from which detainees could choose	BG
2013/48	Detainees are allowed to keep documents or notes relating to their case after meeting with counsel, and the management of remand prisons does not check mail to and from counsel. Means for correspondence are provided if the detainee cannot afford them	LT
	The Attorneys' Act provides a detailed regulation of confidentiality for all forms of lawyer-client communication, protecting them from inspection, copying, verification, seizure, interception, or recording. Lawyers have the right to hand over and receive papers in relation to the client's case without inspection during meetings in places of detention	BG

2016/1919	The Law on State-Guaranteed Legal Aid (SGLA) established a system of state-guaranteed legal aid for persons unable to defend their rights due to financial conditions. Secondary legal aid is provided regardless of wealth or income in cases where counsel participation is mandatory	LT
	Applicants for legal aid may choose their attorney, and the Legal Aid Authority may discharge and replace an appointed attorney who fails to perform duties properly	SI
	Decisions denying legal aid are motivated, made in writing, and subject to appeal. In emergency cases, ex officio lawyers are selected from special lists of duty lawyers and notified no later than three hours prior to the scheduled start of proceedings. National authorities should, as far as possible, consider the preference and wishes of the suspect or accused person in the choice of the legal aid lawyer	BG

22	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2013/48
Source	TRAINAC project, 2015 - Assessment, good practices, and recommendations on the right to interpretation and translation, the rights of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings.	
Summary	The TRAINAC study was published by the Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe (CCBE) and the European Lawyers Foundation.. It examines the implementation of Directives 2010/64/EU and 2012/13/EU on the rights to interpretation, translation, and information in criminal proceedings across EU Member States. The report identifies best practices and gaps in applying these rights, including the availability and quality of interpreters/translators, access to case documents, lawyer-client confidentiality, and informing suspects of their rights. It highlights challenges and differences among Member States in effectively enforcing these directives and offers recommendations to strengthen the protection of defense rights.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country

2012/13	Letter of Rights includes more information than required, such as the right to mediation in criminal proceedings, restitutive discontinuance, conviction without a trial, and voluntary submission to penalty	PL
	Providing court files scanned and on CD-ROM or USB stick, and is working towards online access to criminal files	AT
	Creation of the Independent Authority for the Investigation of Allegations and Complaints against the Police (IAIACAP) to enhance scrutiny of police compliance with the law	CY
2013/48	Belgium implemented 'Salduzweb', an automated system that finds a lawyer within two hours of an arrest, facilitating confidential phone conversations before interrogation and on-site assistance	BE
	Accused person is often assisted by more than one interpreter in lengthy trials	SE

23	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2013/48
Source	"Accessible Letter of Rights in Europe" project, 2017 - Accessible letter of rights in Europe - comparative study	

Summary	This research report examines the provision and understanding of “Letters of Rights” for suspects or accused persons in criminal proceedings, mainly within the EU, with some international comparisons. It highlights issues of linguistic accessibility and completeness, noting that many MS fall short of Directive 2012/13/EU. The report analyses notification methods, factors affecting comprehension and the validity of rights waivers. It concludes with recommendations to improve effectiveness through clearer language, better structure, training for authorities, and effective remedies for non-compliance.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
2012/13	Suspects are informed about their rights three times: immediately upon arrest, again upon arrival at the station with a formal reading and signing, and finally, in the presence of a lawyer and before an official interview	ES
	Some investigating judges personally read rights and start a discussion until convinced the suspect understood. Officers use appropriate words for the intellectual capacity of the person	ES
	Twelve different template letters of rights, keyed to different categories of person and/or proceeding	FR, HU
	If a suspect is under the influence of drugs or alcohol, the reading of the rights must be postponed until the suspect can understand	FR
	The letter of rights is available in each cell of the penitentiary institutions	HU

	Alternative letter of rights decreasing technicality, eliminating legal jargon, included examples and explanations of "hard" legal terms, was made more personal, used simple wording, included a table of contents, was more structured with titles and subtitles, used shorter sentences and bulleted items, and utilized bold letters for emphasis. It also provided detailed information on the right to have another attorney appointed if not satisfied with the current one	HU
	The Notice of Rights and Entitlement has been developed and is available online, with translations of the letter also available online in 60 languages (	UK
	Interrogations will be modified to address the vulnerabilities of the suspect, such as requiring mandatory lawyers for minors	BE, NL
	Accused persons on remand can keep a copy of the document with them during the whole period of detention. Those in police detention who receive a letter of rights can keep it in their possession	BG
2013/48	Waivers of some vulnerable suspects (minors, people with physical or mental disabilities, people who do not speak Lithuanian) are not binding on the investigating authorities or the court if there is reasonable ground to believe that this will compromise their right to defence	LT

24	Related Directive(s)	2013/48, 2016/1919
Source	"Enhancing the Quality of Legal Aid: General Standards for Different Countries" project, 2018 - Practice standards for legal aid providers	

Summary	The document Practice Standards for Legal Aid Providers, developed under the QUAL-AID project, aims to improve the quality of legal aid in criminal proceedings across the EU. It sets out best practices and tools for Member States, focusing on standards in areas such as lawyer education and continuous training, performance evaluation, complaint mechanisms, client choice of lawyer, and principles for effective legal aid delivery. It adopts a "toolbox" approach, allowing countries to select and adapt the most relevant tools to their legal systems.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
2013/48	Legal aid providers meet minimum education requirements, including university law degrees, Bar exams, and specific procedures by the State-Guaranteed Legal Aid Service	LT
	The education system developed a law course for first-line legal aid provision, ensuring students are trained for initial legal assistance	NL
	Basic training programs for newly qualified lawyers require specialized criminal law training or experience, along with 5 supervised cases, for legal aid provider registration	NL
	Mandatory permanent education system, requiring lawyers (including legal aid lawyers) to attend a minimum of 18 training hours per year to keep their knowledge current	FI
	Online training materials are provided by initiatives for lawyers in pretrial detention, and EU-funded online learning platforms cover new EU law standards in criminal proceedings	LT

	Legal aid providers compile and make public informative lists of lawyers, including expertise, experience, and language skills, available at police stations, courts, and online	AT, NL, LT, DE
	Search engines for lawyers, offering filters like area of expertise and language skills to help clients make informed choices	FI, LT
2016/1919	Training courses for judges and prosecutors for defence counsels to foster mutual understanding and exchange views	DE
	Electronic systems are used to conduct client satisfaction surveys through self-evaluation and anonymous client questionnaires, focusing on communication and ethical aspects of legal aid quality	FI
	The Lithuanian State Guaranteed Legal Aid Service conducts regular annual surveys of judges, prosecutors, and police officers to assess their opinion on the quality and work ethics of legal aid lawyers	N/A
	First-line legal aid is provided, offering free consultations and acting as a diagnostic tool to filter legal issues and minimize cost (Legal Service Counters in the Netherlands, municipalities in Lithuania, national telephone hotline in	BG

25	Related Directive(s)	2012/13, 2016/1919
Source	ENABLE project, 2024 - Model disability benchbook on the rights of persons with disabilities in criminal proceedings	

Summary	The Model Benchbook on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Criminal Proceedings reviews international and regional human rights standards on procedural accommodations for defendants with intellectual and psychosocial disabilities. It highlights major barriers to justice, critiques gaps in national laws and EU directives that fail to fully recognize their legal capacity, and provides practical guidelines for justice professionals and policymakers to ensure equal and effective participation. Emphasis is placed on autonomy, supported decision-making, eliminating discrimination, and individualized accommodations rather than a one-size-fits-all approach.	
Directive	Good practice / recommendation	Country
2012/13	Procedural accommodations can be requested by any of the parties, the public prosecutor, the judge, or the person with a disability themselves, and police can request them since the first interactions with a person with a disability	2012/13
2016/1919	Service is offered by a peer support group (BIZEPS), thereby enabling effective access to and use of legal aid	AT

Annexe II: Full analysis of the practices

Practice	A1	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	The LoR is already required by Directive 2012/13/EU Art. 4 and its Annex. Most Member States have rules or templates in place; strengthening plain-language and prompt delivery can be achieved via updated SOPs and templates rather than primary-law reform.
2. Budgetary implications	Low	Costs are mainly translation/printing/layout and brief staff briefing; no structural entitlement or 24/7 staffing is created by A1. The Commission notes that LoRs exist across the EU; improvements tend to be editorial or formatting work rather than new services.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Paper or PDF templates suffice. Optional digitisation (document management; kiosk/tablet) is helpful but not required by the Directive. Verification of delivery can be recorded on standard custody forms without IT build
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Front-line police/custody officers must switch systematically to plain-language LoRs and ensure suspects read and keep a copy.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	A1 is a domestic LoR measure (except where used in EAW), so cross-border dependencies are minimal.
Overall assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	The Directive requires prompt information about rights and the accusation from the moment a person is made aware they are suspected (Arts. 3,4,6).
2. Coverage	High	The LoR applies across all suspects/accused (not only cross-border cases), a point clarified in practice and scholarship and reinforced by CJEU.

3. Compliance	Medium	Art. 8 (verification & remedies) supports oversight, but A1 alone does not create a hard audit trail. Impact rises when A1 is paired with a sign-off step or custody log (e.g., suspect initials to confirm receipt/understanding).
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium-High	Plain language improves comprehension for many, but vulnerable persons (children; cognitive/communication barriers) often need adapted formats and support beyond a standard leaflet.
5. Defence quality	Medium-High	A clearer LoR increases the likelihood that suspects invoke the right to a lawyer, remain silent where appropriate, and understand the accusation.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	A1 (domestic LoR) is distinct from Art. 5 LoR for EAW; A1 does not by itself change EAW fairness (though improved clarity is beneficial in general).
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Easy-High	A1 earns High impact because it delivers clear, prompt, keep-in-hand information about core rights at the precise moments that shape downstream fairness - arrest/intake/pre-interview - fully aligned with 2012/13/EU and the Salduz judgement on effective early defence. It is Easy to replicate as it mainly involves better drafting, translations, and SOP updates to ensure the LoR is plain, promptly given, read, and kept by the suspect. The step from "paper compliance" to real-world value grows further when A1 is coupled with a simple verification step (signature/initials/time stamp)
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards even higher impact		Add verification: a read-and-sign box or custody log (implements Art. 8's spirit). Synchronise A1 with two additional touchpoints (station intake; immediately pre-interview) as per the A5 cadence. Ensure interpreter access and adapted versions (icons/large print/child-friendly) where needed; FRA found that legalistic or dense LoRs undermine comprehension.
Towards lower difficult replication		Provide a core multilingual pack (top languages + "easy-to-read" layout), then allow districts to add local information (contacts, legal-aid phone numbers). The Commission saw that LoRs exist but vary in

	content/quality—centralising the master template reduces drift. Issue a short one-page SOP: who hands the LoR, when (exact timestamp), how to verify, and where to file the confirmation.
--	---

Practice	A2	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low–Medium	Directive 2012/13/EU already allows/foresees oral delivery of rights in simple and accessible language; improvements can be implemented via SOPs and guidance rather than primary-law change.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Sustained language coverage requires recruiting/rosters of multilingual officers and/or routine interpreter access.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	No mandatory IT; however, recording the language used and the officer/interpreter ID in the custody record is recommended for verification.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires coordination of front-line staffing, interpreter services, and training so oral explanations are consistent and timed at arrest/intake. FRA and the Commission note practice variability that SOPs alone may not solve.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Domestic measure (non-EAW).
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Oral explanation at arrest targets the exact moment 2012/13/EU protects
2. Coverage	Medium	Useful across all suspects but effectiveness depends on language matching and shift coverage.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact strengthens when paired with a verification note (time, language, officer/interpreter). Art. 8 supports such records

4. Vulnerable groups	High	Reduces barriers for non-native speakers and persons with low literacy—issues flagged repeatedly by FRA.
5. Defence quality	High	Better understanding increases lawyer uptake and appropriate use of silence, improving equality of arms.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not an EAW-specific measure.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	A2 achieves High impact because it addresses comprehension at arrest, the moment EU law requires prompt, simple, accessible information and the ECtHR demands “practical and effective” safeguards before first interrogation; clear oral explanations in a language the person understands directly increase a suspect’s ability to exercise core rights (lawyer, silence) at the critical decision point. At the same time, replication is Difficult: sustaining reliable language coverage and quality across shifts and locations requires ongoing staffing, interpreter access, and SOP-level coordination, which the Commission and FRA both identify as variable and resource-intensive in practice.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards higher impact		Do read-back/teach-back (“Can you tell me in your words...?”) and log the exchange; pair with A7-style verification
Towards lower difficulty		Blend multilingual rosters with on-demand remote interpretation to cover rarer languages

Practice	A3	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	LoR is mandated by Art. 4; a multi-disciplinary editorial process is an implementation choice (policy/guidance).
2. Budgetary implications	Low	Design, translation, expert review; manageable within communications budgets.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Static document (print/PDF)

4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Co-creation with police, defence, linguists, psychologists yields clearer LoRs but requires organising reviews/updates.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Domestic LoR (not EAW-specific).
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are operational before any substantive questioning occurs.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach hinges on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	Medium	Where audit trails exist (paper tick-box or e-log), remedies under EU law become realistic rather than theoretical.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Tailored support (interpreters, easy-to-read layouts, specialist input) is essential to convert formal rights into effective ones.
5. Defence quality	Medium	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not EAW-specific.
Assessment	Medium	
Conclusion	Medium-Medium	A3 improves the clarity and usability of the Letter of Rights (LoR) delivered at intake, aligning with the Directive's obligation to use simple and accessible language; it reliably raises understanding but, standing alone, only partially strengthens verification unless paired with a sign-off or custody log. Replication is Medium: content work is straightforward under Art. 4, but good results depend on co-creation, version control, and distribution across stations, which requires modest governance beyond mere translation.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards higher impact		User-testing + read-and-sign box; quick refresher before interview (A5 cadence)
Towards lower difficulty		Replication: publish a national master pack + update cadence (annual).

Practice	A4	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Directly aligned with Arts. 3–4 on prompt, comprehensible information; publication is administrative.
2. Budgetary implications	Low	Translation/QA and website/print; routine updates. Commission notes translation and keeping copies are frequent gaps—this practice addresses both.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Web publishing; no integration needed.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Low–Medium	Central team + ministries; minimal cross-agency change
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Domestic; (EAW has separate LoR).
Assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at arrest/station intake and/or immediately pre-interview, the decisive moments for fair proceedings.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly (all arrested/detained persons; all custody sites) when implemented as standard issue.
3. Compliance	Medium	Improves clarity; verification still relies on sign-off or custody logging to be robust.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Language accessibility strongly helps many vulnerable groups; some still need adapted layouts
5. Defence quality	High	Improves the likelihood of timely lawyer uptake, valid exercise of silence, and informed participation.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not address EAW proceedings directly.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Easy-High	it directly fixes an EU-wide pain point—language access—by making official LoR translations readily available, which improves early understanding and rights uptake for non-native speakers at arrest/intake with minimal operational change.

		Replication is Easy because this is essentially translation + dissemination of mandated content under Art. 4, with periodic updates rather than new entitlements.
Margin of change	Explanation	
Towards higher impact	pair with a read-and-sign box and a quick verbal recap immediately before interview; ensure adapted formats where needed.	

Practice	A5	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Directive 2012/13/EU already requires early information on rights (Arts. 3–4), information on the accusation (Art. 6), and allows for verification and remedies (Art. 8). A “three touchpoint” (arrest – station read and sign – pre-interview with lawyer present) is largely implementable via secondary rules rather than a full statutory overhaul – hence not “Difficult,” but more than a pure template rollout.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Costs are mainly training time and document templates/forms (e.g., read and sign), consistent with Art. 9 on training rather than large new entitlements. No sustained 24/7 staffing or large financial commitments are intrinsic to A5.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Can run on paper custody forms and existing logs; IT is optional (though digitisation could help audit). The Directive stresses verification/remedies (Art. 8) but does not require an IT system to achieve this.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Sustained adherence across police/custody staff and reliable pre interview access to a lawyer require standard operating procedures, monitoring and training. FRA's practice research shows variability and gaps in how suspects are informed, implying non-trivial change management to ensure consistency.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	A5 is not EAW specific; it does not require coordination between issuing and executing state.
Overall assessment	Medium	

Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	A5 synchronises rights information at arrest, on station arrival, and immediately pre interview-precisely when decisions to speak or remain silent are made and where the risk of unfairness is greatest. The Directive requires early, practical information (Arts. 3-6), and ECtHR Salduz case underscores that fairness can be irretrievably prejudiced without effective safeguards from the first interrogation
2. Coverage	High	The measure applies to all suspects and standardises practice at scale; 2012/13 sets minimum standards applicable across proceedings and persons, not limited to cross-border cases, supporting broad system reach
3. Compliance	High	The read-and-sign step creates a clear verification trail (aligned with Art. 8 Directive 2012/13), making compliance auditable and improving the practical value of information – areas where FRA observed persistent real-world gaps (unclear/poorly timed information). Repetition plus documentation addresses these gaps directly
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Multiple, structured explanations make it likelier that children and persons with communication/cognitive vulnerabilities actually understand their rights, in line with child-friendly justice/safeguards evidence. While A5 is not child-specific, the cadence and the lawyer-present step materially help vulnerable suspects.
5. Defence quality	High	Re-informing in the presence of a lawyer before questioning supports effective assistance and reduces defective waivers-central aims of Directive 2013/48/EU. The Commission's 2019 implementation report flags issues with scope/derogations/waiver in practice. A5's final touchpoint helps ensure any waiver is informed and recorded, strengthening overall fairness.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	A5 is not tailored to EAW; impact here is neutral (though it complements EAW-specific Letters under Art. 5 Directive [EU] 2012/13 2012/13).
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion		
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards Easy		Jurisdictions that already ensure routine pre-interview, access to a lawyer and use standardised custody

	documentation (Letters of Rights, signatures), the implementation of this practice would mainly need training + standard operating procedure updates, which would reduce effort in the necessary changes.
Toward Difficult	Where pre-interview lawyer access is not reliably guaranteed or where documentation/monitoring is weak (concerns noted by the Commission and FRA), A5 would require deeper reforms (e.g., duty-lawyer schemes, appointment/notification workflows, audit processes), pushing the effort toward 'Difficult'.

Practice	A6	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Within Art. 4 LoR mandate; tailoring/publication are policy/editorial actions.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Editorial/translation and periodic updates.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Static documents (print/PDF).
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Needs taxonomy (e.g., juvenile, detained, summary proceedings), governance, and distribution control to avoid version drift.
5. Cross-border coordination	Neutral	Applies only to domestic LoRs.
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Provided at arrest/detention.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly (all arrested/detained persons; all custody sites) when implemented as standard issue.
3. Compliance	Medium	Improves clarity; verification still relies on sign-off or custody logging to be robust.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Group-specific wording reduces confusion; some still require child-friendly or disability-adapted versions.
5. Defence quality	High	Improves the likelihood of timely lawyer uptake, valid exercise of silence, and informed participation.

6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not apply to EAW proceedings directly.
Assessment	Medium	
Conclusion	Medium-Medium	A6 enhances relevance by tailoring LoRs to common situations (e.g., detained persons, fast-track proceedings), which improves comprehension and the likelihood of informed choices at intake; however, the increase in impact hinges on good taxonomy, distribution discipline, and a verification step. Replication is Medium because editorial work is straightforward, but maintaining multiple authoritative versions and keeping them current across all sites requires light-weight governance.
Margin of change	Explanation	
Towards higher impact	Pair with a read-and-sign box and a quick verbal recap immediately before interview; ensure adapted formats where needed.	

Practice	A7	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Usually achievable via secondary rules; must align with Art. 8 (verification & remedies) and data-protection norms
2. Budgetary implications	High	Procurement/integration; maintenance; training and support.
3. IT system build or integration	High	Integration with custody/case systems; role-based access; secure storage; audit trails.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Police IT, custody staff, DP officers, oversight bodies need governance to ensure reliable use.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at arrest/station intake and/or immediately pre-interview, the decisive moments for fair proceedings.

2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly (all arrested/detained persons; all custody sites) when implemented as standard issue.
3. Compliance	High	Creates traceable audit trails (time, actor, content) and enables remedies and supervision.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Checklist can include flags (interpreter, child, disability accommodation) ensuring tailored delivery.
5. Defence quality	High	Improves the likelihood of timely lawyer uptake, valid exercise of silence, and informed participation.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not apply to EAW proceedings directly.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	A7 generates an audit trail for when/what rights were delivered and by whom, directly enabling Article 8 (verification & remedies) and closing the "practice gap" repeatedly identified by the Commission and FRA; this makes it a high-impact compliance engine at arrest/intake/pre-interview. Replication is Difficult due to IT build/integration, governance, training, and data-protection needs, even if the legal base is already present.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Start with a minimum-viable digital checklist (export + secure portal + audit logs), integrating with custody systems later.

Practice	A8	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	2012/13/EU requires simple and accessible information; disability-responsive procedures are implementable via SOPs; some MS formalise accommodations. [eur-lex.europa.eu]
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Training, adapted formats, occasional support personnel.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Flags/notes in custody records; optional templates.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Coordination with disability services/interpreters; screening for needs.

5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at arrest/station intake and/or immediately pre-interview, the decisive moments for fair proceedings.
2. Coverage	High	High value for an identified group; depends on screening and referral.
3. Compliance	Medium	Checklists plus notation of accommodations create a basic trail; pair with A7 for stronger audit.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Directly benefits persons with cognitive/communication impairments, an area with persistent gaps per FRA.
5. Defence quality	High	Improves the likelihood of timely lawyer uptake, valid exercise of silence, and informed participation.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not apply to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	A8 makes the Directive's "simple and accessible" requirement operational for suspects with disabilities; by improving identification of needs and adapting delivery before interview, it reduces invalid waivers and contested statements – high-value gains at the earliest stages. Replication is Medium: most of the lift is training + SOPs + adapted formats, with limited technology or legislative change.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards higher impact		Pair with a read-and-sign box and a quick verbal recap immediately before interview; ensure adapted formats where needed.

Practice	A9	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Often requires formal procedures (who appoints, when mandatory, documentation).

2. Budgetary implications	High	Sustained multilingual coverage or specialist presence requires rosters, training and call-out budgets.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Only custody record fields to log language/personnel are needed; optional digitalisation.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Front-line coverage/reliability depends on workforce planning and interpreter/specialist agreements.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border proceedings
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Presence during questioning targets the decisive interview moment.
2. Coverage	Medium	Most relevant to children and persons with vulnerabilities; high individual impact.
3. Compliance	Medium	Specialist notes can document comprehension and consent, strengthening later review.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Directly protects minors and vulnerable suspects, consistent with fairness standards seen in ECtHR practice and EU-level standards.
5. Defence quality	High	Reduces invalid waivers and contested statements, improving interview fairness.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not apply to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	A9 provides strong in-room protection at the critical interview stage but requires continuous specialist capacity to scale.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Combine limited multilingual staffing with 24/7 remote interpretation. Publish standard scripts and teach-back mechanisms.
Towards higher impact		Add a simple log (time/language/interpreter ID) and a pre-interview recap to capture refreshed consent and choices.

Practice	A10
Replicability	

Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low–Medium	Aligns with Directive (EU) 2016/800 on procedural safeguards for children; typically implemented via secondary rules/SOPs and training.
2. Budgetary implications	Low–Medium	Design of child-friendly formats, staff training.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Templates/media; optional repositories.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Police, child-protection services, trained practitioners require some coordination efforts.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Targets arrest/station intake and the moments immediately before police interview, where decisions on silence and counsel are made.
2. Coverage	High	Scaled as a standard procedure across custody settings, it can reach all suspects/accused if consistently applied.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact increases when the practice is paired with a simple verification step (sign-off/timestamp) to create an auditable trail.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Tailored support (interpreters, easy-to-read layouts, specialist input) is essential to convert formal rights into effective ones.
5. Defence quality	High	The measure increases valid lawyer uptake and more informed use of silence.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW procedures.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	A10 is a high-yield child safeguard squarely supported by EU law and CoE guidance, with moderate coordination needs.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Adopt a small, reusable library of child-friendly modules (cards, icons, short scripts) and include them in induction.
Towards higher impact		Require a short comprehension check and record it; ensure counsel assistance is triggered at mandatory points.

Practice	A11	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Consistent with Directive (EU) 2016/800 and child-friendly principles; implemented via policy/SOP.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Design/illustration/translation. It also involves periodic updates.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	PDFs/videos; no core integration with IT systems required.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Requires stronger coordination between youth workers, educators, defence lawyers and cross-discipline efforts.
5. Cross-border coordination	Neutral	Does not apply to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Used before interview/court to prepare children, improving understanding of process/rights.
2. Coverage	Medium	Child-specific, with value for this group.
3. Compliance	Medium	Aids comprehension, however verification still depends on delivery logs.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Visuals/multimedia help diverse literacy and cognitive profiles.
5. Defence quality	Medium	Improves informed participation. Indirect effect on interview outcomes (since it depends on timing and lawyer involvement).
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	It is not EAW-specific.
Assessment	Medium	
Conclusion	Medium-Medium	A11 significantly improves understanding and engagement for children using visuals/multimedia but exerts its strongest effect indirectly, by preparing children for what will happen; impact moves higher when deployed just before interview and combined with A10-style behavioural guidance and verification. Replication is Medium because it requires cross-disciplinary drafting and periodic updates, but no heavy IT or new entitlements.

Margin of change	Explanation
Towards easier replication	Adopt a small, reusable library of child-friendly modules (cards, icons, short scripts) and include them in induction
Towards higher impact	Require a short comprehension check and record it, ensuring lawyer assistance.

Practice	AR1	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Requires increased bi-state workflows to ensure formalities, but also actual implementation.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires investment in both states, specifically on translation and liaison.
3. IT system build or integration	Medium	Requires secure cross-border document exchange and communication channels.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	issuing and executing authorities, Bars and SIRENE/central units must coordinate.
5. Cross-border coordination	High	It is an intrinsically cross-border practice
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are operational before any substantive questioning occurs. It also interfaces with strict EAW timelines, making early communication and coordination decisive.
2. Coverage	Medium	Relies on resourcing and local integration to ensure system-level coverage.
3. Compliance	Medium	Where audit trails exist (paper tick-box or e-log), in can be easily monitored.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevance to this group is based on through clearer processes.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	High	It directly relates to EAW cases.

Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	AR1 needs bi-state protocols, secure exchange channels, and strict time management. It is aligned with EAW timelines, needing legal and organisational steps on both sides. Without timely materials, double defence is nominal only. The implementation of this practice could bring tangible changes

Practice	AR2	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Like AR1, it requires strong cross-country workflows to ensure implementation, and some legislative changes.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	In a similar vein as AR1, it requires budget for translation and liaison. Overall institutional costs may increase.
3. IT system build or integration	Easy	Does not require the development of IT systems.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Requires some coordination between actors, but does not need substantial and continuous involvement of all stakeholders.
5. Cross-border coordination	High	It specifically involves cross-border cases.
Overall assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Targets initial moments of proceedings intake and the moments immediately before police interview. It also complies with EAW time limits.
2. Coverage	Medium	It can have system-level reach if consistently applied.
3. Compliance	Medium	Similarly to AR1, its Impact increases when the practice is paired with a simple verification step(sign-off/timestamp) to create an auditable trail.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.

5. Defence quality	High	The measure increases informed awareness of rights.
6. EAW safeguards	High	Directly impacts the provision of rights in EAW proceedings.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Easy-High	AR2 requires editorial work within a clear legal template, as well as translations and distribution through executing authorities and courts. Suspects in EAW cases often misunderstand consent and timelines. As such, a standard, plain document given promptly reduces errors and late retractions.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Pre-agree contact protocols between issuing and executing states, and designate liaison points.

Practice	B1	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Requires secondary rules for audit and data protection, while primary law usually unchanged.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Procurement/integration and maintenance for secure systems; can be reduced if building on existing case/custody platforms.
3. IT system build or integration	High	Integration with custody/case systems and DP safeguards (logging, restricted access, encryption) are central.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Coordination across police IT, Bar/legal-aid, DP Officers and courts; training for frontline users.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Coordination across police IT, Bar/legal-aid, DP Officers and courts; training for frontline users.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at arrest, intake and pre-interview, where choices on silence and counsel are made.

		aligning with the <i>Salduz</i> judgment and early-access aims of 2013/48/EU.
2. Coverage	Medium	Targeted Groups with scope to scale.
3. Compliance	High	When paired with sign-off logs, e-files or accreditation, it creates an auditable trail and strengthens remedies under 2012/13 and 2013/48.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirect benefits via clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier/effective access to counsel, quality assurance and case-file access bolster equality of arms and prevent unfairness.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	It aligns with the relevant EU minimum standards and jurisprudence at the stages where safeguards matter most, while the main implementation effort stems from the criteria highlighted above.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Create SOPs, Leverage existing translations/templates/rosters and bundle training with induction and e-learning.
Towards higher impact		Add formal verification (sign-off logs or e-files), pre-interview legal consultation as standard, and interpreter/disability accommodations.

Practice	B2	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Requires protocols to ensure double defence, timely rights information and coordinated case-file access across issuing and executing MS.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Translation and bi-state liaison; possible legal-aid outlays in both MS.
3. IT system build or integration	Medium	Medium — Secure channels for cross-border communication and document exchange.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Judicial authorities, Bars and SIRENE/central authorities must coordinate under strict time limits.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Intrinsically cross-border

Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are operational before any substantive questioning occurs. It also interfaces with strict EAW timelines, making early communication and coordination decisive.
2. Coverage	Medium	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach hinges on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	Medium	Where audit trails exist, it can be somewhat impactful.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	High	Directly addresses EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult High	It aligns with the relevant EU minimum standards and jurisprudence at the stages where safeguards matter most, while the main implementation effort stems from the criteria highlighted above.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards higher impact		Add formal verification (sign-off logs or e-files), pre-interview legal consultation as standard, and interpreter/disability accommodations.

Practice	B3	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Adopted via Bar/authority rules and MoUs; no primary law change
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Ongoing accreditations delivery and can leverage e-learning.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	LMS tools optional.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Bars, training providers and justice agencies need to coordinate curricula and verification.

5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not address cross-border cases directly.
Assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Influences preparation/quality across the investigation and pre-trial phases rather than the first contact.
2. Coverage	High	Sets standards or entitlements that apply system-wide (e.g., legal aid/CPD), improving consistency across cases.
3. Compliance	High	When paired with sign-off logs, e-files or accreditation, it creates an auditable trail and strengthens remedies under 2012/13 and 2013/48.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirect benefits via clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier/effective access to counsel, quality assurance and case-file access bolster equality of arms and prevent unfairness
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Assessment	Low	
Conclusion	Easy-low	The rating reflects its legal footing, the specific operational dependencies in this category, and its effect on fair decision-making at first contact and pre-interview.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Leverage existing CPD platforms and e-learning; require short assessments for completion
Towards higher impact		Tie CPD to supervised practice thresholds and periodic peer review.

Practice	B4	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Operationalised via SOPs. Legislative changes may not be required.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Schedules, interpreter access, training and supervision drive recurring costs.

3. IT system build or integration	Low	Custody logging should theoretically suffice. Digitalisation only optional and at later stages.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Relies on workforce planning and stable access to language and specialist support.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Intervenes at the point of first contact with authorities, aligning the information step with the pre-interrogation fairness threshold.
2. Coverage	Medium	Coverage depends on standardisation and distribution to all sites. Once institutionalised, it can be applied uniformly to most cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	Compliance strength depends on creating an objective record of delivery that can be reviewed or challenged later.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Particular gains accrue to children and persons with disabilities or low literacy, where comprehension gaps are most acute.
5. Defence quality	High	By clarifying entitlements early, it reduces defective waivers and strengthens defence effectiveness at the time of the first interview.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Does not apply directly to EAW cases.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Practice B4 is difficult to replicate yet delivers high impact. It aligns with the pertinent EU minimum standards and jurisprudence where safeguards are most consequential, while the principal implementation effort derives from the criteria specified above.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Combine limited multilingual staffing with continuous remote interpretation, and publish standard scripts and teach-back mechanisms.
Towards higher impact		Add formal verification (sign-off logs or e-files), pre-interview legal consultation as standard, and interpreter/disability accommodations.

Practice		B5
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Often requires amendments to codes and procedures, in order to widen entitlements or scale.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Requires sustainable funding.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Can be paper-based, with digitalisation needs optional.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires substantial coordination between all actors (judiciaries and Bar associations).
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not address cross-border cases, unless the practice is EAW-specific.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are protected before substantive questioning.
2. Coverage	Medium	It can have a broad application in theory, however field-impact requires high local adherence and adequate resourcing (see above).
3. Compliance	Medium	It can be track where proper compliance mechanisms exist, otherwise its impact can only be theoretical and on a case-by-case basis.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	It is not group-specific, as coverage is, in theory, universal. As above, requires high adherence at local levels.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Requires substantial resources and legislative changes, and its impact is based on a broad adherence. In theory it can have results, but practically it requires surpassing major hurdles.
		Explanation

Towards easier replication	Phase legal changes (pilot derogation limits; staged eligibility expansion) with budget envelopes
Towards higher impact	Add monitoring, pathways for appeal and peer support.

Practice	B6	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Expands and guarantees entitlements (access to counsel, legal aid and scope) beyond current practice; typically needs amendments to codes or legal-aid statutes to comply consistently across all police stations/courts.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Expanded eligibility or earlier triggers (e.g., pre-questioning aid) require sustained funding envelopes, contract management and audits.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	May operate with paper forms and existing registers.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Bars/legal-aid boards, police, prosecution and courts must align on triggers, documentation and remedies; oversight body needed.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Not applicable except if applied with EAW cases.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Influences preparation/quality across the investigation and pre-trial phases rather than the first contact.
2. Coverage	Medium	Scaled as a standard procedure across custody settings, it can reach all suspects and accused if consistently applied.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact increases when the practice is paired with a simple verification step (sign-off/timestamp) to create an auditable trail.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	The measure increases valid lawyer uptake and more informed use of silence, reinforcing equality of arms.

6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Like B5, it can have increased impact if fully applied, however this application needs to be preceded by substantial effort.
Margin of change	Explanation	
Towards easier replication	Similar to B5, phasing legal changes (pilot derogation limits; staged eligibility expansion), along with scalable budget envelopes can lower difficulty threshold.	
Towards higher impact	Add monitoring, pathways for appeal and peer support.	

Practice	B7	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	Secondary rules or protocols on secure e-file access, audit logs and confidentiality are needed, while primary law can be unchanged.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Procurement, integration and maintenance for secure systems is required, however can be reduced if building on existing cases or custody platforms.
3. IT system build or integration	High	It is essential to guarantee Integration with custody, case systems and Data Protection safeguards (i.e., logging, restricted access, encryption).
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires both high coordination across LEAs, IT support services, bars and legal aid providers, Data Protection Officers, and courts, as well as training for frontline users.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Not inherently cross-border.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at arrest, police intake and pre-interview, where choices on silence and counsel are made.
2. Coverage	Medium	Targets specific groups, but can have be scalable.

3. Compliance	High	If paired with sign-off logs, it may create an auditable trail.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Since it improves clarity, it has indirect impact.
5. Defence quality	High	More effective access to counsel, quality assurance and case-file access, strengthening equality guarantees.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	B7 requires heavy investment and professional uptake, however if this is feasible for a given MS it can have impact both at the professional level and of that of suspects and accused persons.

Practice	B8	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	As is the case with B7, secondary rules or protocols on secure e-file access, audit logs and confidentiality are needed, while primary law can be unchanged.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires integration, licensing, support and user training, involving non-negligible resources.
3. IT system build or integration	High	Secure integration with case systems and robust audit logs.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires high coordination across LEAs, IT support services, bars and legal aid providers, Data Protection Officers, and courts.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are protected before initial questioning.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach hinges on resourcing and local uptake.

3. Compliance	High	Creates a durable audit trail (timestamps, user identity, content) that enables remedies and routine oversight.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	The Difficult-High rating reflects the high-dependencies they underpin any replication attempt, while outlining the positive impact it can have in initial stages of proceedings.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Start with a minimum-viable build (export, secure portal and audit logs), integrate with case systems later and train a small pilot cadre first.

Practice	B9	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Falls within 2012/13/EU obligations to give timely, simple information and Letters of Rights. Applying the practice would merely require specific SOPs.
2. Budgetary implications	Low	It would require decreased costs, related to translation, printing and training (on the latter, it would require incorporation into existing training).
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Paper templates or shared drives may suffice, with the use of a document-management system being optional.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Police and custody staff must adopt uniform scripts and templates, as well as supervisory spot-checks.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation

1. Timing	High	Targets arrest/station intake and the moments immediately before police interview, where decisions on silence and counsel are made.
2. Coverage	High	Scaled as a standard procedure across custody settings, it can reach all suspects and accused persons if consistently applied.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact increases when the practice is paired with a simple verification step (sign-off/timestamp) to create an auditable trail.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Tailored support (interpreters, easy-to-read layouts, specialist input) is essential to increase impact.
5. Defence quality	High	The measure increases valid lawyer uptake and more informed use of silence, reinforcing rights protection.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Easy-High	B9 constitutes one of the 4 High-impact practices that be applied easily by professionals and institutions, since it mostly depends on forms, templates and creates meaningful and positive changes in proceedings.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Centralise a national master pack with update cadence and distribution lists.
Towards higher impact		Pair documents with read-and-sign boxes and a brief verbal recap immediately before interview

Practice	B10	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Adopted via Bar and authority rules and through MoUs, with no primary law changes required.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires ongoing CPD design/delivery and assessment.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Use of LMS and IT tools optional.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Bars, training providers and justice agencies coordinate curricula and verification.

5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not directly apply to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Intervenes at the point of first contact with authorities, aligning the information step with the pre-interrogation fairness threshold.
2. Coverage	Medium	Coverage depends on standardisation and distribution to all sites; once institutionalised, it applies uniformly to most cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	Compliance strength depends on creating an objective record of delivery that can be reviewed or challenged later.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	By clarifying claims early, it reduces defective waivers and strengthens defence effectiveness at first interview.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	B10 aligns with the relevant EU minimum standards and jurisprudence at the stages where safeguards matter most. However, the abovementioned difficulties in the replication of this practice make it harder to implement.

Practice	B11	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Medium	It requires secondary rules for audit and data protection, while not requiring changes to primary legislation.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Requires system creation, licensing, support and user training.
3. IT system build or integration	High	Requires secure integration with case systems and robust audit logs.

4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires coordination among IT, police operations, data-protection officers and oversight.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are operational before any substantive questioning occurs.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach hinges on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	High	Creates a durable audit trail (timestamps, user identity, content) that enables remedies and routine oversight.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than cohort-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	Low	
Conclusion	Difficult-Low	B11 does not create any substantial impact, while being difficult to implement.

Practice	C1	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	To expand guarantees (access to counsel/legal aid/scope) beyond current practice, it needs amendments to codes or legal-aid statutes to comply consistently across all police stations and courts.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Expanded eligibility or earlier triggers (e.g., pre-questioning aid) require sustained funding envelopes, contract management and audits.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	May operate with paper forms and existing registers, with optional digitalisation to aid tracking.

4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Bars or legal-aid boards, police, prosecution and courts must coordinate on triggers, documentation and remedies. Additionally, an oversight body is needed.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply directly to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Influences preparation and quality across the investigation and pre-trial phases, rather than first contact.
2. Coverage	Medium	Can be applied system-wide, improving consistency across cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact relies on supervisory steps and standard operating procedures.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Benefits are Indirect, via increased clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Creates effective access to counsel, quality assurance and case-file access, bolstering equality of arms and preventing unfairness in proceedings
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	The implementation of C1 can bring substantial impacts to the protection of children and minors in criminal proceedings, however the replication steps require dedicated investment and effort.

Practice	C2	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	Can be adopted via Bar rules and MoUs, with no primary law changes required.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires ongoing CPD delivery and assessment, but can be leverage through existing e-learning.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Use of IT systems optional.

4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Bars, training providers and justice agencies coordinate curricula and verification.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Increases preparation and quality across the investigation and at pre-trial phases, and does not cover initial contact between the suspects and accused and the criminal justice system.
2. Coverage	High	Sets standards or entitlements that apply system-wide.
3. Compliance	High	If paired with sign-off logs, e-files or accreditation, it creates an auditable trail and strengthens remedies.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirectly benefits the protection of rights of vulnerable groups via clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Increases access to counsel, quality assurance and case-file access, improving protection of safeguards.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	Rule change via Bar/Ministry instruments; training capacity and assessment needed but manageable. Directly addresses competence gaps; improves advice at arrest/interview and in court for children.
Margin of change		Explanation

Practice	C3	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	C3 Expands rights (access to counsel/legal aid/scope) beyond current practice. As such, it requires amendments to criminal procedural codes or legal-aid provisions to be applied consistently across all police stations/courts.

2. Budgetary implications	High	Expanded eligibility or earlier triggers (e.g., pre-questioning aid) require sustained funding envelopes, contract management and audits.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	It can operate, theoretically, with paper forms and existing registers. It does not require development of IT systems.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires tight coordination between all actors and institutions, in addition to an oversight body.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	It does not apply to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Similarly to C2, it impacts preparation across the investigation and pre-trial phases, and not at first contact.
2. Coverage	High	Standards created apply to the whole system.
3. Compliance	Medium	Impact relies on supervision rather than hard logs.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirect benefits via clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Improves defence by improving Earlier/effective access to counsel, quality assurance and access to case-file.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Legal reform, budget expansion, administration and fraud controls required, as well as strong governance required, in order to sustain equity and speed. Ensures that counsel is available where most needed, reinforcing equality of arms from the start.
Margin of change		Explanation

Practice	C4	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	It requires changes to criminal procedural codes and to existing legal aid systems.

2. Budgetary implications	High	Expanded eligibility or use in earlier moments of proceedings (e.g., pre-questioning) require sustained funding envelopes, contract management and audits.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	May operate with paper forms and existing registers, with optional digitalisation to aid monitoring.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Like in the case of C3, it requires continuous coordination between all actors.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply directly to cross-border proceedings.
Assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Does not apply to initial contact between the suspect and criminal procedure, however covers initial interviewing.
2. Coverage	High	Sets standards or entitlements that apply system-wide, improving consistency across cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	Gains rely on supervision rather than hard logs.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Is impacted indirectly via the above mentioned system-wide coverage.
5. Defence quality	High	Defence can improve due to ensuring effective access to counsel; however it depends on the effectiveness of its application.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Requires statutory commitment and ongoing budgets, as well as integration with appointment systems and quality monitoring. Eliminates administrative delays/denials that otherwise block early assistance

Practice	C5	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Bi-state workflows must be formalised and sustained across time.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires translation and liaison. Legal-aid costs may arise in both states.

3. IT system build or integration	Medium	Requires, at least, secure cross-border document exchange/communication channels.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Issuing and executing authorities, Bars and SIRENE/central units must coordinate to apply this practice effectively.
5. Cross-border coordination	High	High — intrinsically cross-border.
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Applies at arrest/intake/pre-interview, where choices on silence and counsel are made.
2. Coverage	Medium	Targeted groups with scope to scale to other groups.
3. Compliance	Medium	Relies mostly on supervision.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirectly benefits vulnerable persons via clarity and earlier assistance.
5. Defence quality	High	Ensures early access to counsel, quality assurance and access to case-files.
6. EAW safeguards	High	Directly improves fairness within EAW time limits (double defence, rights information, legal aid) and cross-border communication.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	Legal and budget reforms; cross-border coordination for funding and eligibility; strict timelines. Without early aid, rights are theoretical at the interview/EAW stage; C5 guarantees counsel is in place when decisions matter.

Practice	C6	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Guarantees access to counsel and increases legal aid scope) beyond current practice. Therefore, it requires amendments to codes or legal-aid statutes to comply consistently across all police stations/courts.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Expanded eligibility, requiring sustained funding envelopes, contract management and audits.

3. IT system build or integration	Low	May operate with paper forms and existing registers. Digitalisation as optional measure to aid tracking.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires strong coordination between Bars, legal-aid boards, police, prosecution and courts In order to agree on triggers, documentation and remedies. An oversight body is also needed.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply directly to cross-border cases.
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	C6 applies within the legally protected early window, ensuring rights are operational before any substantive questioning occurs.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach depends on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	Medium	Where audit trails exist (paper tick-box or e-log), impact may extend beyond theory.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than group-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation and contestation of evidence where necessary.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW proceedings.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	C6 requires legislative change, budgets and administrative controls; careful design to prevent abuse while maintaining speed. At the same time, it ensures representation at the exact point where suspects and victims need informed advice most.
Margin of change		Explanation
Towards easier replication		Phase legal changes (pilot derogation limits or staged eligibility expansion) with budget envelopes.

Practice	C7	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation

1. Legislative	Low	C7 can be implemented via Bar/authority rules and memoranda, not requiring changes to primary law.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires some adjustments – and therefore investment – to training procedures, beyond changes to curricula.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Use of Learning Management Systems is optional.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Where needed, requires strong coordination between all actors to ensure alignment in curricula.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Low cross-border value.
Overall assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Influences preparation of professionals, however requires consistent application to extend beyond practice.
2. Coverage	Medium	Can be implemented system-wide
3. Compliance	Medium	Compliance on this practice relies on adequate reviews on the provision of training.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirectly ensures protection via better preparedness.
5. Defence quality	High	Theoretical impact depends on the implementation of lessons learned.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	Programme design, provider capacity and scheduling needed. Does not require substantial changes to legislation. Cross-system understanding can contribute to reduced friction in early stages of proceedings, and improves consistent application of safeguards.

Practice	C8	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation

1. Legislative	Medium	It can implemented via standard operating procedures. Legislative changes required only if no pre-established legislation.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Requires investment in training, specialist support, training and supervision.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	Integration into IT systems not required, but could be an added value.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Relies on workforce planning and stable access to language and specialist support.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Applies mostly to domestica cases.
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Intervenes at the point of first contact with authorities, aligning the information step with the pre-interrogation threshold.
2. Coverage	Medium	Coverage relies on standardisation and distribution to all sites. However, once institutionalised, it can apply uniformly to most cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	Compliance strength depends on creating an objective record of delivery that can be reviewed or challenged later.
4. Vulnerable groups	High	Design choices should anticipate language, literacy and cognitive barriers, with adapted formats or assistance where relevant.
5. Defence quality	High	It reduces defective waivers and strengthens defence effectiveness at first interview.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	C8 has similar operational and budget footprints as B4. It requires heavy investment and continuous support, as well as coordination with Bar Associations. Closes the access gap at the most time-critical points and supports informed decisions before interviews.

Practice	C9
-----------------	-----------

Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	It can be adopted via Bar associations and legal aid services, not requiring changes to legislation.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires some investment, at the baseline level and monitoring level.
3. IT system build or integration	Low	As is the case for C8, Integration into IT systems not required, but could be an added value.
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Requires coordination between Bars, legal aid providers and training providers to coordinate curricula and verification.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Overall assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Practice applies to quality of legal aid, not necessarily timing of legal provision. In a similar vein as other training-related practices, its impact relies on the application of learning gathered and, on a case-by-case basis.
2. Coverage	Medium	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach relies on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	Medium	Depends on institutional monitoring.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Relevant primarily through clearer processes rather than cohort-specific adjustments.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation in cases.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	

Practice	C10	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation

1. Legislative	Medium	Requires secondary rules for audit and data protection. Primary law can remain unchanged.
2. Budgetary implications	High	Requires heavy investment in development of systems, licensing, support and user training.
3. IT system build or integration	High	Requires secure integration with case systems and robust audit logs.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires strong coordination among IT, police operations, data-protection officers and oversight bodies.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Overall assessment	Easy	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Acts at the earliest stages of proceedings, where choices on silence and counsel are made.
2. Coverage	Medium	Coverage is at 'Medium' level, however if implemented can have system-wide coverage.
3. Compliance	High	High — When paired with sign-off logs, e-files or accreditation, it be tracked and overseen,
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	As other practices, if applied correctly it can have positive impact in vulnerable persons.
5. Defence quality	High	Effective access to defence, quality assurance and case-file access can have positive impacts.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	Low	
Conclusion	Easy-Low	Collation and publication need, as well as periodic verification. Minimal IT required if a simple web page is used. C10 Improves navigation but only indirectly affects early-stage safeguards unless tied to rapid contact mechanisms.

Practice	CR1	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	High	Accreditation/selection rules are typically set by statute or Bar regulations, requiring some changes to ensure applicability.

2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Peer review, audits and mentoring require resourcing.
3. IT system build or integration	Medium	Registry and monitoring tools can prove beneficial.
4. Stakeholder complexity	High	Requires coordination at Bar association, Ministry, legal-aid board governance and appeal mechanisms.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases directly.
Overall assessment	Difficult	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	High	Influences preparation and quality across the investigation and pre-trial phases.
2. Coverage	Medium	Standards or entitlements can be applied system-wide (e.g., legal aid/CPD), improving consistency across cases.
3. Compliance	Medium	When paired with monitoring systems, it creates an auditable trail and strengthens remedies.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Indirect benefits vulnerable persons via the system-level coverage.
5. Defence quality	High	Quality access to counsel improves protection of rights across the whole procedure.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral/Not applicable	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Difficult-High	CR1 requires statutory or Bar-regulatory changes, governance, resourcing, audits and mentoring. CR1 can create, however sustained improvements in defence quality across the system, including at arrest stages.

Practice	CR2	
Replicability		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Legislative	Low	It can be adopted via Bar association and MoUs; with no primary law changes required.
2. Budgetary implications	Medium	Requires ongoing CPD delivery assessment but can leverage existing training offers.

3. IT system build or integration	Low	Use of Learning Management Systems optional
4. Stakeholder complexity	Medium	Requires coordination between Bars and training providers, to adjust curricula and verification.
5. Cross-border coordination	Low	Does not apply to cross-border cases.
Overall assessment	Medium	
Impact		
Criteria	Assessment	Explanation
1. Timing	Medium	Impact depends on the applicability of training to a real-world setting. Advantages arrive from the training itself.
2. Coverage	High	Applies broadly by design but real-world reach depends on resourcing and local uptake.
3. Compliance	High	Compliance can be monitored through evaluation and periodic oversight.
4. Vulnerable groups	Medium	Vulnerable groups are impacted by the potential system-level coverage.
5. Defence quality	High	Earlier understanding and proper documentation underpin better preparation of professionals.
6. EAW safeguards	Neutral	Not applicable to EAW cases.
Overall assessment	High	
Conclusion	Medium-High	Implemented via Bar/authority rules. It requires provider capacity and funding, however lower than reforms to accreditation. CR2 as High impact potential, since it has broad, durable uplift that reaches the police-station stage as well as later hearings.



FULL-PROOF.EU

Co-funded by the European Union.

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.