Basic information

2010/2308(INI) INI - Own-initiative procedure	Procedure completed
European Union's internal security strategy See also 2013/2636(RSP) **Subject** 7.30.09 Public security	

Key players

European Parliament

Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
LIBE Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs	BORSELLINO Rita (S&D)	26/10/2010
	Shadow rapporteur HANKISS Ágnes (PPE) ALFANO Sonia (ALDE)	

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
AFET Foreign Affairs	GOMES Ana (S&D)	11/01/2012

Council of the European Union

Council configuration	Meetings	Date
Justice and Home Affairs (JHA)	3071	2011-02-24

European Commission

Commission DG	Commissioner
Migration and Home Affairs	MALMSTRÖM Cecilia

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
16/12/2010	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
24/02/2011	Resolution/conclusions adopted by Council		Summary
12/04/2012	Vote in committee		
24/04/2012	Committee report tabled for plenary	A7-0143/2012	Summary

21/05/2012	Debate in Parliament		
22/05/2012	Decision by Parliament	T7-0207/2012	Summary
22/05/2012	Results of vote in Parliament		
22/05/2012	End of procedure in Parliament		

Technical information

Procedure reference	2010/2308(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative
Amendments and repeals	See also 2013/2636(RSP)
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 55
Other legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 165
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	LIBE/7/04825

Documentation gateway

European Parliament

Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee draft report		PE473.725	09/01/2012	
Amendments tabled in committee		PE480.655	09/02/2012	
Committee opinion	AFET	PE480.693	14/03/2012	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A7-0143/2012	24/04/2012	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T7-0207/2012	22/05/2012	Summary

European Commission

Document type	Reference	Date	Summary
Commission response to text adopted in plenary	SP(2012)542	24/09/2012	
Commission document (COM)	COM(2013)0179	10/04/2013	Summary
Commission document (COM)	COM(2014)0365	20/06/2014	Summary

National parliaments

Document type	Parliament /Chamber	Reference	Date	Summary
Contribution	PT_PARLIAMENT	COM(2013)0179	11/10/2013	

European Union's internal security strategy

2010/2308(INI) - 20/06/2014

The Commission presents the final implementation report of the EU Internal Security Strategy 2010-2014.

BACKGROUND: the report recalls that the 2010 Internal Security Strategy (ISS) was defined to enable the European Union to respond to existing and emerging threats to the security of European society, its citizens and organisations in the EU.

The Strategy aims at identifying the challenges to the EU internal security in the context that many of today's security challenges are cross-border and cross-sectoral in nature and that no single Member State is able to respond effectively to these threats on its own. The Strategy also identifies **common principles and guidelines** – fully respecting fundamental rights – underpinning a European Security Model, and aimed at further developing common tools and policies by using a more integrated approach.

The Commission Communication on "EU Internal Security Strategy in Action" identifies **five main strategic objectives** to be pursued by the EU and its Member States to be more effective in preventing and fighting serious and organised crime, terrorism and cybercrime, in strengthening the management of our external borders and in building resilience to natural and man-made disasters:

1. disruption of international criminal networks,
2. prevention of terrorism and addressing radicalisation and recruitment,
3. raising levels of security for citizens and businesses in cyberspace,
4. strengthening security through border management,
5. increasing Europe's resilience to crises and disasters.

The Commission reported in 2011 and 2013 on the implementation of the ISS and adapted the actions and recommendations to new developments.

In its latest Communication, the Commission concludes that "the next and last report on implementation of the ISS will be presented in mid-2014. The report will assess whether the objectives of the ISS have been met and also consider future challenges within the field of internal security".

This is the aim of this report.

CONTENT: this third and final Report on the ISS 2010-2014 has a two-fold aim: (i) it assesses the actions implemented under the five ISS strategic objectives since 2010; (ii) it identifies possible future challenges, cross-cutting objectives and emerging threats in view of a renewed Internal Security Strategy. In preparing this Report, the Commission has taken account of the resolution by the European

Parliament on the second ISS report.

Main achievements from 2010-2014: since 2010, significant progress has been made under these objectives, as shown by the Commission's two ISS reports and this Report. The ISS 2010-2014 has been the backbone of EU internal security initiatives in the last years. It has contributed to further enhancing the capabilities of the EU, its Member States, and other stakeholders and to reinforcing operational cooperation among Member States. It also contributed to a more cross-sectorial approach at all levels.

Several challenges had to be faced in the implementation of the Strategy. The financial crisis, and the resulting budgetary constraints, in Europe somewhat hampered the availability of resources. New technologies provided new opportunities for security stakeholders but at the same time created new threats including the fast growing threat of cybercrime and the need to formulate a comprehensive approach to counter it. Allegations of large-scale intelligence collection programmes, although not directly related to law enforcement cooperation, sparked in an intense debate on the conditions under which security should be achieved. This led to a reinforced resolve to safeguarding **mutual trust**, defining more inclusive security policies and the need to strengthen the integration of fundamental rights into internal security policies.

Finally, on the external dimension of security, the EU was confronted with the effects of regional conflicts and major political changes such as the Arab Spring, conflicts in Sub-Saharan Africa and the conflict in Syria; these have had an impact on the EU's internal security.

Those challenges confirmed the need for the ISS, which has been effectively implemented, both through general initiatives and through initiatives relating to each of its five specific objectives.

- **Legislation and cooperation mechanisms** now provide common tools to better protect European societies and economies from serious and organised crime.

- **Increased law enforcement and judicial cooperation** has proved essential for responding to common threats such as trafficking in human beings, terrorism, cybercrime and corruption.

- Considerable efforts were undertaken to **enhance application of the multidisciplinary and integrated approach** – one of the key objectives of the ISS – in view of addressing increasingly complex security challenges.

It should be noted that the Standing Committee on Internal Security (COSI), created by the Lisbon Treaty, became operational in 2010. COSI is progressively becoming the centre of gravity of the integrated, multiagency operational approach on EU internal security.

Challenges to be tackled: implementation of legislation and consolidation of these achievements, as well as enhanced practical cooperation will be priorities for future work. Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of legislation and policies will allow EU actions to be adjusted. Prevention, detection and investigation require increased and effective information sharing between Member States' law enforcement authorities and judicial authorities, with relevant EU agencies and among EU agencies themselves using existing EU instruments to the full.

The citizen-centred approach should remain a guiding principle for EU internal security and for the opportunities and challenges that lie ahead.

Thematic challenges include:

- tackling organised crime and cybercrime;
- combating terrorism, radicalisation and crisis management;
- strengthening border security.

Cross-cutting objectives aim to:

- strengthen the link between EU internal and external security;
- strengthen the respect of fundamental rights as part of a citizen-centred approach;
- strengthen the role of research, funding and training.

Main conclusions: the report concludes that the **five strategic objectives chosen in the ISS 2010-14 remain valid** and should therefore be confirmed for the renewed ISS.

Building upon the positive assessment on the implementation of the first ISS, the EU should develop an **updated version of the ISS** in full cooperation between the Commission, Member States and the European Parliament. Focus should be on reviewing the actions under each objective for 2015-2020 and **identifying new actions to address the emerging threats** and evolving challenges.

The renewed ISS should reinforce the integration of fundamental rights within internal security and make the link between internal and external security even more operational.

It should also consolidate and encourage more synergies between Home Affairs and other policy areas related to internal security. To this end, a stronger action will be needed to consolidate interactions between policies and actions, involving the different actors, such as public authorities, citizens, civil society and the private sector.

To support such a multidisciplinary and integrated approach, an **EU Internal Security Consultative Forum** animated by the Commission together with Member States, European Parliament, EU agencies, representatives of civil society, academia and of the private sector could be considered.

Lastly, the report notes that the Commission will prepare this Communication after consulting relevant stakeholders, including through a High-Level Conference that will take place in autumn 2014, with the participation of Member States and of the European Parliament, as well as representatives of civil society, academia and the private sector.

European Union's internal security strategy

2010/2308(INI) - 10/04/2013 - Follow-up document

The EU’s Internal Security Strategy (ISS) is designed to enable Europe to respond to existing challenges and emerging threats, according to a shared approach that involves both EU actors and the national and local levels. This Second Report on the implementation of the **EU Internal Security Strategy** looks at the progress made in 2012 as well as identifying the challenges to be tackled in 2013.

The ISS is based on **five strategic objectives**, namely (i) disrupting international crime networks; (ii) preventing terrorism and addressing radicalisation and recruitment; (iii) raising levels of security for citizens and businesses in cyberspace; (iv) strengthening security through border management; and (v) increasing Europe’s resilience to crises and disasters.

In the 2011 ISS implementation report, the **fight against organised crime** and **cybercrime** were identified as two main challenges to be addressed in 2012.

Conclusions: the report concluded that implementation of the Internal Security Strategy is well on its way. It shows that much has been achieved for each of the five objectives. However, there is still a way to go.

For 2013, **organised crime** is still considered to be one of the major challenges for EU internal security to address.

Money laundering, corruption, trafficking and mobile organised crime groups are just some of the threats foreseen.

Cybercrime continues to be of particular concern.

Another important challenge for 2013 is to improve tools to better counter growing **violent extremism**.

The next and last report on implementation of the ISS will be presented in mid-2014. The report will assess whether the objectives of the ISS have been met and also consider future challenges within the field of internal security.

European Union's internal security strategy

2010/2308(INI) - 24/02/2011

The Council adopted conclusions on the Commission's communication on the European Union Internal Security Strategy in Action of 22 November 2010.

In its conclusions, the Council agrees that the European Security Model, as defined by the Internal Security Strategy and contributed to by the Commission's communication, should be based on a shared agenda for action, an appropriate balance between prevention and tackling the consequences of threats to security, the development of security policies based on common values and a renewed effort to establish closer links between the external and internal aspects of EU security and to promote initiatives designed to strengthen the capacity for action of third countries.

It recalls that the five strategic objectives for internal security developed by the Commission, are as follows:

1. the disruption of international criminal networks,
2. the prevention of terrorism and addressing radicalisation and recruitment,
3. raising levels of security for citizens and businesses in cyberspace,
4. strengthening security through border management,
5. increasing Europe’s resilience to crises and disasters.

The Council calls on the Commission to cooperate with the Standing Committee on Internal Security (COSI), within its mandate, with a view to ensuring that:

- the implementation of the Internal Security Strategy reflects a shared agenda for action,
- the strategic objectives for EU internal security developed by the Commission regarding the fight against serious and organised crime remain consistent with the priorities to be defined by the Council on the basis of the Organised Crime Threat Assessment report in 2011 and the Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment reports from 2013 onwards,
- funding for EU internal security, including within the framework of a potential Internal Security Fund in the next multi-annual financial framework, reflects the strategic objectives and priorities of the Internal Security Strategy, facilitates the best possible implementation of the prioritised actions by the relevant national authorities and agencies and remains sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation to new security threats and challenges.

The Council underscores the urgency of fostering closer cooperation between actors engaged in the external and internal dimensions of EU security, notably with the newly established European External Action Service.

It invites the Member States to ensure a level of participation at COSI that reflects COSI’s mandate of facilitating cooperation on internal security.

It invites the Commission to submit to the European Parliament and the Council by the end of 2011 its first annual report on actions taken within the framework of the Internal Security Strategy, to provide regular updates on actions taken to strengthen internal security within the Union and to take account, in its annual reporting, of the reporting mechanism set out in the EU policy cycle for organised and serious international crime.

European Union's internal security strategy

2010/2308(INI) - 24/04/2012 - Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading

The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs adopted the own-initiative report by Rita BORSELLINO (S&D, IT) on the European Union’s Internal Security Strategy. It recalls that the Treaty of Lisbon has strongly anchored EU security policy to a specific EU rule of law, laying the foundations for the development of a security agenda closely shared by the EU and the Member States and subject to democratic oversight at European and national level.

Members reaffirm that the Commission’s communication on the Internal Security Strategy (ISS) for the period 2010-2014 has identified five priority areas in which the EU can provide added value, namely i) fighting and preventing serious and organised crime, ii) terrorism, iii) cybercrime, iv) strengthening the management of the external borders, and v) building resilience to natural and man-made disasters.

While welcoming the results achieved to date, they call for further security measures in compliance with Union‘s fundamental rights obligations.

Respect for fundamental rights and subsidiarity: Members emphasise that freedom, security and justice are objectives that must be pursued in parallel, and believes that the implementation of the EU Charter must be the core of any fully-fledged ISS. They recall that, in order to achieve freedom and justice, security must always be pursued in accordance with the principles of the Treaties, the rule of law and Union‘s fundamental rights obligations. They underline the importance of coherence and synergies between the internal and external aspects of security, and underscore the importance of ensuring that measures and actions implementing the ISS are in compliance with Union‘s fundamental rights obligations, in particular Articles 2, 6 and 7 TEU, and its external policy objectives as laid down in Article 21 TEU, as well as with international human rights and humanitarian law. Noting that policies in the arrea of security are a shared competence between the Union and the Member States, Members recall that this is an area in which subsidiarity needs to be respected in the context of a comprehensive and coherent approach.

“EU operational cycle”: Members note the progress made by the Member States and the Commission in the context of the EU policy cycle on organised and serious international crime. However, they consider that a clear division of tasks between EU and national levels is necessary. Parliament needs to be part of the process as regards policy guidance, implementation and evaluation of results, and Members call for an in-depth assessment of the European policy cycle to be undertaken in 2013. In their view, moreover, the cycle should be renamed the **“EU operationalcycle”**. In

particular, they call on the Member States to regularly assess the complementarity of national plans for countering organised crime with plans which are to be developed at European level. It is essential to provide appropriate financial resources in the 2014-2020 multiannual framework for the implementation of such a strategy.

Involvement of Parliament in determining the ISS:

Members recall that the European Parliament is now a fully-fledged institutional actor in the field of security policies, and is therefore entitled to participate actively in determining the features and priorities of the ISS and of the EU Security Model and in evaluating those instruments. In this connection and on the basis of the existing cooperation between the European Parliament and national parliaments, Members endorse the idea of a ' parliamentary policy cycle' which would conclude with an **annual parliamentary report** on the current state of play as regards the ISS.

Complementarity between the AFSJ and external policy: Members note that the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) have complementary points and highlight the importance of the appropriate exchange of information, consultation and cooperation with all relevant actors, as also of solutions aimed at anticipating rather than reacting to events. They also stress that the entire ISS should in the long term concentrate on the clear link between **external threats**.

Key areas of the ISS: Members consider that the ISS's objectives are not exhaustive and that the order of priorities could have been better structured. They underline, in particular, that the **fight against terrorism and organised crime** is and must remain a key priority within the ISS. They call on the Commission and the Council to prioritise the **fight against corruption**.

They take the view that:

- the issue of resilience to man-made and natural disasters, including failures of critical infrastructure, must also be addressed;
- it does not appear fully justified or appropriate to take action in the field of the enforcement of intellectual property rights within the framework of the ISS;
- organised crime, in all its forms including mafias, constitutes a growing threat to freedom, security and justice for EU citizens and that fighting it must remain a priority, as do money laundering and white-collar crime.

Other areas are mentioned such as: i) the funding of terrorism, ii) freezing the funds of persons suspected of terrorism, iii) help to victims of terrorism (Members call on the Commission and the Member States to consider adopting specific legislation in this regard), iv) the **combat of environmental, economic and corporate crime,** the impact of which is particularly detrimental to the living conditions of EU citizens, v) the fight against cybercrime (Members, once again, urge the Member States to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime).

Strengthening of cooperation: in Members' view, enhancing EU police and judicial cooperation, including through Europol and Eurojust as well as through appropriate training, is critical to a proper ISS. This cooperation must involve the competent authorities in the Member States as well as EU institutions and agencies. Members call on the Commission and the Member States to make this a priority for the ISS.

Justice dimension of the ISS: Members regret the fact that the ISS still lacks a proper "justice dimension". Mutual trust must be strengthened by progressively developing a European judicial culture based on the diversity of legal systems and on unity through European law. The judicial systems of the Member States should be able to work together coherently and effectively, in accordance with their national legal traditions: believes that the establishment of a set of priorities in the field of judicial cooperation must be seen in the context of the close link between all the dimensions of the Area enshrined in Title V TFEU, namely the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice.

Intelligence and enforcement: Members stress the fight against terrorism is a priority for the ISS, whose objectives and tools must be properly evaluated, as expressed in Parliament's resolution on 'the EU Counter-Terrorism Policy. They take the view that better focusing is needed on **targeted law enforcement and on intelligence-driven activities** that have proven capacity to prevent terrorist attacks and are carried out in accordance with the principles of necessity, proportionality and respect for fundamental rights.

Prevention: members consider it crucial to develop prevention mechanisms, in particular so as to permit the **early detection of signs of violent radicalisation or threats**, including threats from violent or militant extremism. They recall the importance of actions directed at countering violent radicalisation in vulnerable populations and look forward to innovative solutions in this field. It is a question of defining a wider political strategy that involves the security dimension as well as immigration, asylum and development policies at EU level and policies supporting economic, social and democratic development and promoting human rights in third countries. Cooperation with countries sharing borders with the EU would also be necessary.

Review of the ISS: Members consider it expedient to undertake a mid-term parliamentary review of the Stockholm Programme **before the end of 2013**, in order to assess its strategic, legislative and financial priorities. They also believe that a complementary assessment is needed with regard to the relevant European agencies currently being 'Lisbonised' (Europol, Eurojust and the European Judicial Network), along with other agencies and bodies.

Personal data protection: Members recall that the processing and collection of personal data in the framework of the ISS must in all circumstances comply with the EU's data protection principles, especially those of necessity, proportionality and legality. Although they welcome the data protection proposals put forward by the Commission on 25 January 2012, they are of the opinion that the proposal for a directive in the field of judicial cooperation in criminal matters and law enforcement must be more ambitious and must provide for stronger safeguards, especially in its provisions on profiling and automated processing. Members reaffirm the need for proper **democratic oversight and evaluation of the work of AFSJ agencies,** in order to avoid the risk of blurring the divide 'between policy advice and actual policy-making' in relation to those agencies.

Solidarity clause: lastly, Members urge the Vice-President/High Representative and the Commission to present their proposal – planned for 2011 – on the implementation of the solidarity clause, which should not duplicate existing initiatives, but, rather, define the framework for the use and coordination of available EU and national instruments, including the CSDP. They believe that only with the full spectrum of possibilities opened up by the implementation of the solidarity clause among all Member States will the EU be ready to prevent – and react to, in a safe and coordinated manner – any given threat targeting the security of one or more Member States.

European Union's internal security strategy

2010/2308(INI) - 22/05/2012 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

The European Parliament adopted by 503 votes to 55, with 56 abstentions, a resolution on the European Union's Internal Security Strategy.

Parliament recalls that the Treaty of Lisbon has strongly anchored EU security policy to a specific EU rule of law, laying the foundations for the development of a security agenda closely shared by the EU and the Member States and subject to democratic oversight at European and national level. It reaffirms that the Commission's communication on the Internal Security Strategy (ISS) for the period 2010-2014 has identified five priority areas in which the EU can provide added value, namely (i) fighting and preventing serious and organised crime, (ii) terrorism, iii) cybercrime, (iv) strengthening the management of the external borders, and (v) building resilience to natural and man-made disasters.

While welcoming the results achieved to date, Parliament calls for further security measures in compliance with Union‘s fundamental rights obligations.

Respect for fundamental rights and subsidiarity: Parliament emphasises that freedom, security and justice are objectives that must be pursued in parallel, and believes that the implementation of the EU Charter must be the core of any fully-fledged ISS. It recalls that, in order to achieve freedom and justice, **security must always be pursued in accordance with the principles of the Treaties**, the rule of law and Union‘s fundamental rights obligations. Members underline the importance of coherence and synergies between the internal and external aspects of security, and underscore the importance of ensuring that measures and actions implementing the ISS are in compliance with Union‘s fundamental rights obligations, in particular Articles 2, 6 and 7 TEU, and its external policy objectives as laid down in Article 21 TEU, as well as with international human rights and humanitarian law. Noting that policies in the area of security are a shared competence between the Union and the Member States, Members recall that this is an area in which subsidiarity needs to be respected in the context of a comprehensive and coherent approach.

“EU operational cycle”: Parliament notes the progress made by the Member States and the Commission in the context of the EU policy cycle on organised and serious international crime. However, it considers that a clear division of tasks between EU and national levels is necessary. Parliament needs to be part of the process as regards policy guidance, implementation and evaluation of results, and Members call for an in-depth assessment of the European policy cycle to be undertaken in 2013. In their view, moreover, the cycle should be renamed the “**EU operational cycle**”. In particular, they call on the Member States to regularly assess the complementarity of national plans for countering organised crime with plans which are to be developed at European level. It is essential to provide appropriate financial resources in the 2014-2020 multiannual framework for the implementation of such a strategy.

Involvement of Parliament in determining the ISS: considering that the European Parliament is now a fully-fledged institutional actor in the field of security policies, Parliament considers that it has the right to participate actively in determining the features and priorities of the ISS and of the EU Security Model and in evaluating those instruments. In this connection and on the basis of the existing cooperation between the European Parliament and national parliaments, Members endorse the idea of a ‘parliamentary policy cycle’ which would conclude with an annual parliamentary report on the current state of play as regards the ISS.

Complementarity between the AFSJ and external policy: Parliament notes that the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) have complementary points and highlights the importance of the appropriate exchange of information, consultation and cooperation with all relevant actors, as also of solutions aimed at anticipating rather than reacting to events. It also stresses that the entire ISS should in the long term concentrate on the clear link between **external threats**.

Key areas of the ISS: Parliament considers that the ISS’s objectives are not exhaustive and that the order of priorities could have been better structured. It underlines, in particular, that the fight against terrorism and organised crime is and must remain a key priority within the ISS. It calls on the Commission and the Council to prioritise the fight against corruption.

Members take the view that:

- the issue of resilience to man-made and natural disasters, including failures of critical infrastructure, must also be addressed;
- it does not appear fully justified or appropriate to take action in the field of the enforcement of intellectual property rights within the framework of the ISS;
- organised crime, in all its forms including mafias, constitutes a growing threat to freedom, security and justice for EU citizens and that fighting it must remain a priority, as do money laundering and white-collar crime.

Other areas are mentioned such as: (i) the funding of terrorism, (ii) freezing the funds of persons suspected of terrorism, (iii) help to victims of terrorism (Members call on the Commission and the Member States to consider adopting specific legislation in this regard), (iv) the combat of **environmental, economic and corporate crime**, the impact of which is particularly detrimental to the living conditions of EU citizens, (v) the fight against cybercrime (Members, once again, urge the Member States to ratify the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime).

Strengthening of cooperation: in Members’ view, enhancing EU police and judicial cooperation, including through Europol and Eurojust as well as through appropriate training, is critical to a proper ISS. This cooperation must involve the competent authorities in the Member States as well as EU institutions and agencies. Parliament believes that, as regards the links between internal and external security, EU cooperation with other international institutions such as NATO and the OSCE should be further promoted. It calls on the Commission and the Member States to make this a priority for the ISS.

Justice dimension of the ISS: Parliament regrets the fact that the ISS still lacks a proper “justice dimension”. Mutual trust must be strengthened by progressively developing a European judicial culture based on the diversity of legal systems and on unity through European law. The judicial systems of the Member States should be able to work together coherently and effectively, in accordance with their national legal traditions: believes that the

establishment of a set of priorities in the field of judicial cooperation must be seen in the context of the close link between all the dimensions of the Area enshrined in Title V TFEU, namely the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice.

Intelligence and enforcement: Parliament stresses the fight against terrorism is a priority for the ISS, whose objectives and tools must be properly evaluated, as expressed in Parliament's resolution on 'the EU Counter-Terrorism Policy. It takes the view that better focusing is needed on targeted **law enforcement and on intelligence-driven activities** that have proven capacity to prevent terrorist attacks and are carried out in accordance with the principles of necessity, proportionality and respect for fundamental rights.

Prevention: the resolution states that all security policy must include a prevention component, which is particularly essential in a period in which economic and social inequalities are growing and thus jeopardise the effectiveness of fundamental rights.

Parliament considers it crucial to:

- develop prevention mechanisms, in particular so as to permit the **early detection of signs of violent radicalisation or threats**, including threats from violent or militant extremism. It recalls the importance of actions directed at countering violent radicalisation in vulnerable populations and look forward to innovative solutions in this field ;
- **define a wider political strategy that involves the security dimension** as well as immigration, asylum and development policies at EU level and policies supporting economic, social and democratic development and promoting human rights in third countries. Cooperation with countries sharing borders with the EU would also be necessary.

Review of the ISS: Parliament considers it expedient to undertake a mid-term parliamentary review of the Stockholm Programme **before the end of 2013**, in order to assess its strategic, legislative and financial priorities. It also believes that a complementary assessment is needed with regard to the relevant European agencies currently being 'Lisbonised' (Europol, Eurojust and the European Judicial Network), along with other agencies and bodies.

Personal data protection: Members recall that the processing and collection of personal data in the framework of the ISS must in all circumstances comply with the EU's data protection principles, especially those of necessity, proportionality and legality. Although they welcome the data protection proposals put forward by the Commission on 25 January 2012, they are of the opinion that the proposal for a directive in the field of judicial cooperation in criminal matters and law enforcement must be more ambitious and must provide for stronger safeguards, especially in its provisions on profiling and automated processing. Members reaffirm the need for proper **democratic oversight and evaluation of the work of AFSJ agencies,** in order to avoid the risk of blurring the divide 'between policy advice and actual policy-making' in relation to those agencies.

Solidarity clause: lastly, Parliament urges the Vice-President/High Representative and the Commission to present their proposal – planned for 2011 – on the implementation of the solidarity clause, which should not duplicate existing initiatives, but, rather, define the framework for the use and coordination of available EU and national instruments, including the CSDP. It believes that only with the full spectrum of possibilities opened up by the implementation of the solidarity clause among all Member States will the EU be ready to prevent – and react to, in a safe and coordinated manner – any given threat targeting the security of one or more Member States.