

General programme "Security and Safeguarding Liberties": specific programme "Prevention and fight against crime, 2007-2013

2005/0035(CNS) - 12/06/2018 - Follow-up document

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; (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. **ISEC's general objectives** were to prevent and combat crime, particularly terrorism, trafficking in persons, offences against children, drug trafficking, arms trade and trafficking, cybercrime, corruption and fraud. **The key points regarding the ISEC** may be summarised as follows:

Relevance: the report notes that overall, Member States considered **ISEC's objectives relevant** to their needs related to prevention of and fight against crime. For instance, the specific objective related to coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, and related EU bodies was considered highly relevant to the needs in the sector, especially in the context of internationalisation of crime and professionalization of criminal groups.

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: overall, the evaluation findings suggest that **ISEC contributed to all of its objectives to some extent** and the projects funded achieved the expected outputs. The main results identified from ISEC projects were: (i) enhanced networking and enhanced sharing of information and best practices; (ii) increased levels of knowledge and skills of practitioners. ISEC projects were particularly effective in contributing to the development of transnational cooperation between Member States and law enforcement agencies, as well as better exchange of information, particularly in the field of forensics, drugs, Passenger Name Records, cybercrime and trafficking in human beings.

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 ISEC amounted to EUR 522 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.

Coherence: ISEC supported the implementation of EU obligations and cross-border cooperation among Member States in a large number of crime areas. However, in a context of financial crisis, national funding was very scarce, preventing significant risk of duplication of EU funds with national funding streams. The evaluation also identified a **substantial scope for coherence and complementarity** between ISEC and other EU Programmes, namely the criminal justice programme JPEN, DAPHNE III, FP7 and Hercule II. Synergies were achieved between [DAPHNE III](#) and the two ISEC specific objectives relating to the promotion and development of best practices for protection and support of witnesses and crime victims, especially in the area of trafficking in human beings. Effective coordination at both design, implementation and delivery stage was crucial to maximize the potential for coherence and complementarity and to avoid the risk of duplication. It can be concluded, on the basis of the evidence collected, that this was achieved to a large extent.

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.

The important contribution of ISEC funding to **transnational cooperation** and implementation of EU law in the various areas covered by the prevention and fight against crime was highlighted during a high number of interviews with all types of stakeholders. It was concluded that ISEC made a **significant contribution to national law enforcement agencies** cooperating closer transnationally, to building mutual trust, and to the formation of new relationships between organisations working with counterparts in other Member States

The report concludes by noting that EU added value could have improved with the establishment of a central repository at Commission level gathering all project results and a more even spread of coordinating organisations across Member States.