



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL MIGRATION AND HOME AFFAIRS

Directorate E: Migration and Security Funds
Unit E.1: Union actions

Brussels,
HOME/E1/LN

- 8. 07. 2016

EVALUATION REPORT

Part III – Remaining award and selection criteria

Grant award procedure: Call for proposals "Transnational initiatives to fight trafficking in drugs and firearms" (HOME/2015/ISFP/AG/TDFX)

1. Procedure

1.1. Working method

All 15 applications received went through the evaluation steps in accordance with the "Evaluation rules for 2015 Calls for proposals" for which Unit HOME.E1 is responsible, established by the note Ares(2015)6011359 of 22 December 2015.

The admissibility, eligibility and exclusion checks were recorded in part I of the evaluation report (Ares(2016)1050969 - 01/03/2016) – see Annex 3. A letter notifying the ineligibility of one project application was sent on 7 March 2016 (Ares(2016)1148362).

The assessment of the relevance award criterion was recorded in part II of the evaluation report (Ares(2016)1659653 of 07/04/2016) – see Annex 4. Seven letters notifying unsuccessful applicants who had not reached the minimum threshold of 21 points were sent on 12 April 2016 (Ares(2016)1726029).

In accordance with the evaluation methodology, the proposals satisfying the admissibility, eligibility and exclusion criteria, as well as the relevance award criterion, were evaluated by the Evaluation Committee with regard to the remaining award criteria (quality, cost-effectiveness and European added value). The final ranking list of project proposals, taking into account all award criteria (i.e. including relevance) was established. The fulfilment of selection criteria (operational capacity and financial capacity) for these projects was assessed by unit E.1.

1.2. Calendar

Publication of the call: 23 September 2015

Submission deadline: 1 December 2015

Conclusion of the admissibility, eligibility and exclusion criteria evaluation: 1 March 2016

Conclusion of the relevance award criterion evaluation: 7 April 2016

With regard to the assessment of the remaining award criteria (quality, cost-effectiveness and European added value), the Evaluation Committee held the following meetings:

Date	Place	Topic discussed	Attendees
28 June 2016	DG HOME	The Evaluation Committee discussed the remaining award criteria of the project applications passing through the admissibility/eligibility/exclusion and the relevance award criterion steps.	Members of the Evaluation Committee

The consolidated evaluation forms assessing the award criteria (see Annex 2) and the final ranking list of projects were approved by the Evaluation Committee members by e-mails of 5 and 6 July 2016.

2. Evaluation of the remaining award criteria

7 proposals were evaluated and ranked on the basis of the pre-announced remaining award criteria. The overall threshold for award criteria was 65 points out of 100, i.e. including the score received during the relevance award criterion assessment. 6 of the 7 projects were evaluated by external experts [REDACTED], with the consolidated evaluation being prepared by the Evaluation Committee members from D.2 and D.4 and consequently discussed and approved by the Evaluation Committee.

All of the evaluated projects passed the required quality threshold.

3. Evaluation of the selection criteria

7 proposals were verified for their compliance with the pre-announced operational and financial capacity criteria.

As a result of the verification it was concluded that none of the proposals should be rejected based on the operational and financial capacity criteria.

4. Conclusions and recommendations – remaining award criteria and selection criteria

On the basis of the above verification the following recommendations are made for the remaining award criteria and selection criteria evaluation:

- None of the evaluated proposals has been rejected due to non-compliance with the remaining award and selection criteria.
- 7 proposals satisfying all pre-announced criteria are proposed for funding and are listed in Annex 1.

– There is no need to establish a reserve list as all projects proposed for funding can be financed by the budget of the Call.

The award decision listing all awarded (7) and rejected (8) proposals will be prepared by E.1 for the adoption by the authorising officer.

Members of the Evaluation Committee

Names	Department	Date	Signature
[REDACTED] - President	HOME.E.1	8/7/16	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - Member	HOME.D.4	8/7/16	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] - Member	HOME.D.2	8/7/2016	[REDACTED]

Annexes

- Annex 1 - List of proposals satisfying all pre-announced criteria and proposed for funding
- Annex 2 - Consolidated award criteria evaluation forms (7 projects)
- Annex 3 - Part I of the Evaluation report - Admissibility, eligibility and exclusion criteria
- Annex 4 - Part II of the Evaluation report – Relevance award criterion

Annex 1 - List of proposals satisfying all pre-announced criteria and proposed for funding

Proposal N°	Name of applicant	Names of co-applicants	Title of proposal	Score for relevance	Justification
4000008733	The National Police of the Netherlands (NL)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bundeskriminalamt (DE) 2. Direktion für Spezialeinheiten (A) 3. Keskusrikospoliisi (FI) 4. Carabinieri Raggruppamento Operativo Speciale (IT) 5. Federale Politie België, Directie Special Units (B) 6. An Garda Siochana (IRL) 7. Gendarmerie National ECASGN (FR) 	CSW: Cross Border Surveillance on Drugs and Firearms	90,5/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the project objectives are very relevant to drug & firearms area, they go even beyond the priorities of the call, thus covering other areas as well (e.g. THB, illegal migration, terrorism). 2. The project demonstrates very clear European added value in the highly sensitive area of covert surveillance. Given its critical mass with 14 Member States and Europol involved, the project possesses a good multiplier effect, with obvious benefits for the fight against organised criminals and terrorists. 3. The project has also the potential to improve working relationships with the law enforcement agencies in key third countries beyond the borders of the EU. 4. By developing new surveillance capabilities in the EU the project will support the fight against trafficking in drugs and firearms. 5. Project results are both realistic and promising. The project's methodology and the project management concept are credible and sound. 6. The budget is carefully prepared and budget items are directly connected with project activities. Nevertheless, staff cost to be funded by the project would merit clarification as they are foreseen only for the project leader and for the project secretary. It is not fully clear how staff costs for the other staff involved in the project will be covered by their respective national budgets.
4000008735	General Inspectorate of Romanian Police (RO)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southeast European Law Enforcement Center (IO) 2. Ministry of Interior – Directorate for Combating Organized Crime (BG) 3. Drejtoria e policise se shetit (ALB) 4. Ministry of security (BiH) 5. Direzione Centrale della Polizia Criminale (IT) 	Strengthening the fight against firearms trafficking in South-eastern Europe	71/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project fits the priorities of the call and is highly relevant to a priority geographic zone. 2. The project demonstrates a sound understanding of current policy and operational developments. 3. The project's overarching objective is pertinent but some of the specific objectives are not well defined. It is not clear exactly how project activities will strengthen the fight against firearms trafficking in South-Eastern Europe. 4. One of the most important outputs from the project could

					<p>be the training centre in the field of dark net markets for firearms trafficking. However, the establishment of this centre is not described in detail. Complementarity with existing bodies needs to be clarified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project management concept is sufficiently developed and the proposed dissemination strategy is appropriate, with the relevant target groups and stakeholders defined. The project has a clear European geographical coverage. However, the real European added value and the impact on strengthening the fight against firearms trafficking in South-Eastern Europe are not sufficiently substantiated. With regard to the budget, staff costs as well as costs for the training centre seem to be underestimated. The project has a clear European dimension as organizations from three EU Member States are directly involved. Several other EU Member States are involved indirectly as demonstrated by Letters of support from competent authorities. The establishment of a regional network of firearms experts seems over-ambitious and is not clearly described in the Description of action.
4000008739	Federal Ministry of the Interior/Criminal Intelligence Service (A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Police of the Czech Republic, the Nat. D. H. of the Criminal Police/Investigation Service (CZ) Ministry of Internal Affairs of Republic Kosovo, Kosovo Police (KO) 	Joint investigation to fight trafficking in drugs and firearms with the main focus on international airports within and also into the EU	68/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal fits within the three priorities of the call addressing the arms and drugs trafficking phenomena with a particular focus on airports. The proposal would contribute to the implementation of the EU Drugs Strategy as well as would support the implementation of the OAPs within the Policy Cycle. The objectives of the proposals have been clearly defined. Nevertheless, the project results have not been fully justified and some aspects of the management process, in particular as regards the dissemination and sustainability, failed to convince as they remained on a level of generalities. The proposed methodology is appropriate and logical. Overall the presented cost estimate can be considered as convincing and relatively good. However, the expected project results have not been fully justified and remain to some extent hypothetical. The proposal addresses broadly the EU added value criterion, but its geographical coverage is somewhat limited. The actual added value will be conditional upon the

					successful completion of planned police operations.
4000008742	Research Centre on Security and Crime (IT)	1. Risk Monitor (BG) 2. VILIAS (LT) 3. Academy of criminalistic and police studies (SRB)	Project NARCO-MAP. Improving knowledge on NPS and opiates trafficking in Europe	85/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal covers an area where further investment is needed, in particular as regards enlarging the scientific knowledge base. In that perspective it should be considered as potentially vital for the policy. 2. The proposal is of good quality. The objectives linked to both research and networking are clearly presented and are fully relevant to the call for proposals. 3. The methodology proposed by the applicant is solid and matches well the proposal. 4. The project management plan, monitoring and evaluation aspects have been outlined, but could be more detailed. 5. The budget is balanced, realistic and fully proportionate to the size and importance of the proposal. The types of costs correspond very well to the planned activities. 6. The EU added value of the proposal is very good in terms of expanding knowledge base on NPS at EU level. The number of EU member states involved in implementation, although limited, is appropriate for achieving the desired results.
4000008745	Karpacki Border Guard Support Center (PL)	1. Police of the Czech Republic National Drug Headquarters Criminal, Police and Investigation Service (CZ)	FADGUNS – Fighting against drugs and guns	76/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is of a good quality, equipped with a relevant methodology. 2. The desired results are realistic and the team of partners, although small, is adequate for the attainment of the activities to be carried out. 3. The proposal appears to represent a good value for money. The typology of costs relates well to the specificity of the activities listed in the description and the amount of the grant requested is proportionate to the size of the project. 4. The project management description could be further developed to include fully the coordination mechanism. 5. The choice of two partners representing only two member states somewhat limits the European added value of the project if measured against the background of the trafficking phenomenon. A matching EU-wide dissemination strategy could offset the weakness of the proposal to some extent and should be considered by the applicant.

					6. In addition, it might also be useful to refer to EMCDDA and its role as a data collection mechanism for the completeness of the project.
4000008746	Federal Police (BE)	1. Bundeskriminalamt Wiesbaden (DE) 2. National Institute of Criminalistics and Criminology (NICC) (BE)	Detection of drugs trafficking & drugs production: Train the trainers course, course curriculum, toolkit & exchange of best practices	80/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal demonstrates good quality of the prospective activities and results in the area of training for drugs detection. It is equipped with a matching methodology. 2. The objectives of the proposal are clear and the project management plan is solid. 3. The amount of the grant requested by the applicant is proportionate to the size and importance of the training activities and the upgrade of the training centre into an EU centre of excellence. 4. For some of the costs listed in the budget estimate and linked to the development of the training centre the applicant failed to present an adequate justification. Similarly, the proposal does not provide sufficient evidence on how the national training centre would be successfully transformed into an EU centre of excellence. 5. The proposal has a good EU added value as regards providing training activities in the area of drugs detection. 6. The dissemination strategy is well explained and elaborated, with the target groups and communication channels well identified.
4000008748	Flemish Peace Institute (BE)	1. SIPRI (SE) 2. Scuola Superiore di Studi Universitari e di Perfezionamento Sant'Anna (SSSA) (IT)	Studying the Acquisition of illicit Firearms by Terrorists in Europe	86/100	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The project demonstrates an adequate understanding of current policy and operational developments. 2. It addresses a topical problem with great implications for the fight against terrorism and organized crime in Europe. The project's objective, activities and results are carefully designed. 3. The proposed qualitative research methodology is credible for achieving project results. 4. The project management concept is sound. The responsibilities of the different management bodies are well-defined. The measures for monitoring and evaluation are appropriate. As a shortcoming, the timeframe (12 months) is short and might not be sufficient for carrying out all project activities. 5. Indicators for measuring the project's outcome are not sufficiently described in the proposal. 6. Overall, the budget is drafted in line with project activities.

					<p>However, the costs for subcontracting are not adequately justified and therefore do not provide evidence that they represent the best value for money. Some clarification will be required before the potential signature of the Grant Agreement.</p> <p>7. The project has a clear European dimension. A satisfactory number of EU Member States are directly or indirectly involved in the project. Given the importance of the problem the expected impact concerns all EU Member States.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---