General programme "Security and Safeguarding Liberties": specific Programme "Prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism", 2007-2013

2005/0034(CNS) - 12/06/2018

In accordance with Decisions 2007/125/JHA and 2007/124/EC, the Commission presents an ex post evaluation report on two specific programmes: “Prevention and Fight against Crime” (ISEC) and “Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security-related Risks” (CIPS), both part of the Framework Programme on “Security and Safeguarding Liberties” for the period 2007- 2013.

The report is based on the findings of two ex post evaluations that assessed the programmes, in the period 2007 to 2013, against the evaluation criteria defined in the better regulation guidelines: effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, relevance, EU added value. The Commission notes, however, that the evaluations of both programmes were significantly hindered by: (i) the lack of baseline, i.e. a clear description of the situation before the start of the Programmes which could serve as a basis for assessing their impacts; (ii) the lack of ex ante targets and of a central repository for ISEC/CIPS project results; (iii) lack of sufficient data for carrying out a detailed comparison of costs, given the wide range of policy areas.

The report makes a number of observations that are pertinent to both programmes. CIPS (2007-2013) focused on critical infrastructure and other security issues, including operational issues in areas such as crisis management and preparedness in various sectors of critical importance. **The key points regarding the CIPS** may be summarised as follows:

Relevance: overall, Member States considered CIPS of **continuous relevance** to the prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism and other security-related risks throughout the evaluation period. The programme responded well to a real need for **transnational cooperation** and coordination in this area, which was particularly important given the need for EU level action in these fields and the lack of alternative national sources of funding due to the consequences of the 2008 financial crisis on national budgets.

The report notes, however, that the funding set-up of both programmes was demand-driven rather than policy-driven, and consequently, there was a **significant geographical imbalance** in their implementation. In order to allow Member States more equal access to funding as well as to improve their participation in all key security policy priorities, a shift towards shared management mode was introduced for the successor Fund, ISF-Police.

Effectiveness: CIPS broadly achieved its general and most of its specific objectives, contributing positively to the policy area of critical infrastructure protection. An important element of a number of CIPS projects was the focus placed on **interdependencies** and the **prevention of ‘cascading effects’** in case of disruption and destruction of critical infrastructures during a terrorist attack or other security-related risks. However, the report notes that EU-wide cooperation and cooperation of protection of critical infrastructures could be improved.

Efficiency: the evaluation results show that the EU funding provided was perceived as sufficient for all activities implemented under both ISEC and CIPS. The **creation of networks** was viewed as having a high value for money.

The total allocated **budget for CIPS** amounted to EUR 126.8 million for the whole period. As regards the levels of EU funding, overall, the evaluation shows that EU funds were sufficient to implement the planned activities. On the other hand, the **absence of a peer review on project results** and the **absence of a central repository** were perceived as having **decreased** the overall efficiency of the programmes. Whilst monitoring has improved, these aspects have not yet been put into practice under the successor programme (ISF – Police) but could be taken into consideration for the next multiannual financial framework.

The Commission notes that the **creation of a central repository** containing detailed data on individual projects would have enabled the development of a monitoring system to collect and analyse data on financial progress, outputs and results of projects.

Coherence: the report CIPS actions carried out under the 2007-2013 Annual Work Programmes were found to be coherent with activities funded under other similar EU Funds, namely FP7 and the Civil Protection Financial instrument. Indeed, little to no evidence of overlap occurred between these funding instruments due to their differing features in terms of thematic focus, eligible actions and eligible stakeholders and target groups.

EU added value: findings suggest that organisations did not often have access to national funding opportunities to implement the programmes' activities, so that a significant part of the projects would not have been developed in the absence of the ISEC and CIPS funding.

A key aspect of EU added value lay in the programmes ability to foster transnational cooperation. Both CIPS and ISEC had a strong **transnational dimension** by supporting either transnational projects or national projects with potential for transferability to other Member States. **CIPS's EU added value** was also positively evaluated through its contribution to the development of policies of the Union in the field of prevention, preparedness and consequence management of terrorism and other security-related risks and enhancing coordination and cooperation between relevant actors at EU level in protection of critical infrastructure.

However, the EU added value could have been higher with:

- the establishment of a central repository at Commission level gathering all project results and the dissemination of transferable outcomes of projects at EU level;
- a more even spread of coordinating organisations across Member States.