



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL HOME AFFAIRS

Directorate A : Internal Security

**ISEC 2012**

**Framework Partners**

**ACTION GRANTS**

**RESTRICTED CALL FOR**

**PROPOSALS**

**(first deadline)**

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

<b>SUMMARY DATA</b>	
<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003739</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	PUBLIC MINISTRY -POHCCJ
<b>Project title:</b>	Fostering of the detection and prosecution of money laundering offences
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	RO
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	15
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	General Prosecutor's Office of Spain (ES); General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police (RO)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Tackling money laundering as a stand alone crime is still regarded with reluctance by legal professionals in Romania. After years of practice conditioning the money laundering crime to the proof the predicate offence, the concept of the autonomy changes the object of probation from the existence of the predicate offense to the illegal origin of the good and the author's knowledge that the good has derived from criminal activity.</p> <p>To change such practice and to bring extra value to the process of detecting and prosecuting money laundering, the current project brings together legal practitioners from Romania and Spain to exchange expertise and best practices and to jointly find solutions for better performance in dealing with such crimes. The common efforts are meant, on one hand, to promote among Romanian judicial practice the autonomous character of the money laundering offence and, on the other hand, to draw a set of typologies for the offences that generate money with potential to be laundered and for the modus operandi and means to conceal the illicit origin of money. Such indicators that could raise a red flag for financial investigators and emphasize the occurrence of money laundering from an early stage.</p> <p>The project outcome will be achieved in the framework of a series of three workshops attended each by a number of 12 Spanish prosecutors and judges, prosecutors and police officers from Romania, facilitated by two experts on this subject, that will be contracted by the project coordinator on the basis of strict criteria in respect of their expertise. Among the workshop participants, a working group will be established with one Spanish prosecutor and one judge, two prosecutors and one police officer from Romania that will attend all events and at the end, under the coordination of the experts will design a manual with all findings, the collection of typologies as well as relevant jurisprudence from EU MS. The project main findings and the manual will be presented and disseminated during an international conference in Bucharest attended besides the workshop participants by other 10 judicial actors from various EU MS with tradition in prosecuting money laundering as a stand-alone crime and other stakeholders from Romania and Spain.</p> <p>The project duration is 15 months and it is expected that project will determine the increase of the number of final convictions on money laundering in the spirit of the FATF recommendations and EU Directives on countering money laundering in Romania and Spain and to this effect, the dismantling of organized groups operating trans-nationally not only in these two countries but internationally.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	134.298

<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	120.868
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** NOT AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 50

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objective of the project is to help Romanian prosecutors to approach money laundering as an independent crime following Spanish Public Prosecutor experience in the issue. The aim of the project is in line with general ISEC objective to stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order. It is also in line with the Call of proposals for 2012 in the field of financial and economic crime. Beneficiaries and target groups in Romania are relevant to the aim of the project as they are competent authorities to prosecute this type of crime. Problematic however is the (exclusive) domestic focus on Romania.

The likely impact of this ISEC project is to be considered on the medium term as it will allow to re-orientate the way Romanian prosecutors undertake the money laundering cases and this will allow them to follow a common approach as other Member States. However, apart from possible positive impacts in Romania, there are no prospects for the proposed project to have a meaningful impact on EU level, either in other MS or in terms of delivering useful inputs for EU policies or practices. The involvement of some 10 people from other member states (on top of Spanish staff involved) is quite pointless from that perspective. The proposed impact indicators are either non-functional (numbers of participants, workshops held etc) or non-realistic (the claim that the project will prompt more prosecutions and convictions can never be measured at the end of the 15 month project, and not even in the immediate aftermath of it; makes the impact totally uncontrollable) and, hence, do not convince. Given that Romanian authorities are the exclusive beneficiaries, it seems that national or EJT/Cepol/Taiex funding would be far more appropriate than ISEC funding.

A general explanation about the objectives of the project is given by the applicant. Training activities will lead to promote the autonomous prosecution of money laundering cases but also a manual will be produced. Despite the fact that the project is aiming to enhance anti money laundering strategies, it is fixing better to financial investigation when referring to Recommendation 30 FATF in a future perspective. The deliverables and outputs (conference, manual etc) are mainstream. The proposal just lists activities (appointment of experts, workshops, conference), rather than pointing out how the domestic shift towards tackling money laundering as a stand-alone offence will actually happen. The Applicant has identified some very general risks or none; the risk mitigation proposed is weak and it seems to be unrealistic. The fundamental risks of the project, being that the beneficiary and target group needs have only been very poorly and vaguely identified and are low in number, that the project will not add anything to the international & EU state of knowledge and best practices, that no EU impact will be realised at all and the project will at best prompt some domestic positive effects in Romania only, are not addressed at all.

The proposal actually lacks a real methodology. The stated 'multi-phase approach' is not self-explanatory nor sufficient to convince. Training activities have been organised in both partner countries. No IT or web based techniques have been envisaged so the manual and training will be reaching a limited number of beneficiaries. Final conference does not give an added value to the project itself but reinforces the dissemination strategy. Other up to date training methodologies could contribute to expand the impact of the training. The partner network is extremely closed and limited (involvement of just some Spanish staff, the functional role or specific expertise whereof has moreover been insufficiently underpinned, especially

since the proposal itself indicates that 2 experts will need to be hired, next to exclusively Romanian law enforcement and prosecution staff).

The transnational character of the project and its geographical span are poor: exclusive focus on Romania only, with only some Spanish officials being involved and a final conference with limited number of participants. Any relevant impact beyond Romania (even there to be assessed fairly low) is unlikely.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Conformity with ISEC and Call priorities. Clear description about the purpose, type of activities and number of deliverables and outputs.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Vague identification of beneficiary and target group needs. Poor project conception and methodology. Incomplete budget. Merely domestic orientation. No credible prospects to deliver European added value.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The principal cost is for domestic training in Romania only. Staff cost are zero but there should be a list of staff and the reason why costs are zero, especially because external consultants are announced to be hired by public procurement but apart from travel and DSA costs, there is no information about their fees or salaries. A list of staff even at zero cost would be needed to see if the number of persons involved is sufficient apart from project leader, project managers and financial expert. The amount grant sought is proportionate to the number of activities and participants. Manuals produced on CD or on line manuals could lead to save some budget but also Final Conference could be substituted by other dissemination strategy e.g. taking the chance of any other EU event on Brussels with the participation of experts from all MS. The project is risky in terms of value (doubtful; supra), even if the nominal budget is not high. No multiplier prospects.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003741</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	NATIONAL POLICE BOARD
<b>Project title:</b>	Developing the exchange of DNA data under the Prüm Decision and the related post-hit procedure
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	FI
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Politsei- ja Piirivalveamet (Police and Border Guard Board) (EE); Eesti Kohtuekspertiisi Instituut (Estonian Forensic Science Institute - EFSI) (EE); Rikskriminalpolisens, Enheten för Internationellt Polissamarbete (IPO) (Swedish NBI) (SE); Statens Kriminaltekniska Laboratorium (SKL) (National Laboratory of Forensic Science) (SE); Openbaar Ministerie, Stafbureau voor de coördinatie van IRC's (Public Prosecution Service, Staff bureau for MLA) (NL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Europol (NL)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>1. Short-term objectives: to further develop the post-hit procedure following the comparison of DNA data under the Prüm Decision, to increase related international cooperation and to improve the assessment of the effectiveness of the data exchange. The long-term objective: to create a common mechanism for the post-hit exchange of law enforcement DNA data under the Prüm Decision on a timely manner, with as much impact as possible on the competent authorities at European level. Europol will ensure the alignment of this objective with Europol projects such as as UMF2 (common data model) and SIENA.</p> <p>2. Activities: study visits to participating countries/organisations, research and examination of working methods, examination of channels to exchange information, writing of case studies and best practices, an end seminar.</p> <p>3. Duration: 1 January 2013 - 31 December 2014.</p> <p>4. Methodology: describing and comparing the processes and working methods, identifying common best practices, gathering cases for study of impact on criminal investigation and deterrence of crime, organising a seminar and writing an end report for further development work.</p> <p>5. Participants: The project will be carried out by the Finnish National Bureau of Investigation (NBI)/International Affairs as the sole beneficiary. The Forensic Laboratory's DNA Analysis function at the NBI will also be involved in the project. 6 organisations have given partnership declarations: the Estonian Central Criminal Police and Forensic Science Institute, the Swedish NBI and Laboratory of Forensic Science, Dutch Public Prosecution Service and Europol.</p> <p>6. Target groups: police and judicial authorities and forensic laboratories in the participating countries, which are directly involved in the project. More generally, all law enforcement agencies which deal with the exchange of Prüm data and international matters.</p> <p>7. Expected results and deliverables: a) There are clear national post-hit procedures in the forensic laboratories and competent law enforcement/judicial authorities of the participating countries. b) There are well-functioning communications between the national authorities receiving matching data and the law enforcement/judicial authorities. c) The competent authorities are aware of the importance of "DNA hit</p>	

data" to their work in practice and know how to use the information they receive. d) The foreign authorities to be contacted for further information are known, and direct contacts between the authorities work well. e) Different channels for transmitting requests for further information and answers to other countries are evaluated and tested. f) There is a common understanding of the law enforcement data being exchanged. g) It is known which method is used to measure the importance of matching data. . h) An in-depth understanding of processes and practices used by different countries in the exchange of DNA data.

8. Dissemination strategy: Descriptions of working processes and best practices are submitted directly to the participating authorities. The end seminar will also deal with these matters and serve as a venue for information gathering and exchange. The end report will be sent to all relevant participants via Europol and the DAPIX group. An open and classified version of the end report will be published. Case studies collected during the project will be open as far as possible and they can be used for further scientific studies. A possibility for a website (using Europol's experts network) will be considered and evaluated.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	270.046
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	243.041,4
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 73  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 181.516,85

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objectives are properly defined and in line with the programme's objectives. The project addresses priorities identified in the call for proposals. The project addresses a real need at EU level, with regard to improving the Pruem data exchange, in particular the post hit info exchange. Target groups and further beneficiary audiences have been realistically and adequately identified. The broader embedment of the project activity in state-of-the-art EU developments relating to SIENA, the Uniform Messaging Format 2 (UMF2) and the work concerned of Europol (involved as an associate partner) and DAPIX, is a distinct asset.

The impact of the project is that the info exchange under the Pruem Decision is improved, used methods of different MS will be explored, made transparent and improved, and international cooperation will be fostered. The indicators to measure the project outputs are not clearly spelled out. As the project's outputs could be used after the project and the Pruem data exchange will also continue, the benefits from the project will also have an impact after the project. The impact on the target groups could be high, subject to their acceptance of the project outcomes. The dissemination strategy is adequate. The visibility scheme of EU funding seems to be quite weak. The impact of this project could be evaluated by monitoring the number and speed/time of data exchanges under Pruem between the involved countries.

The proposal explains sufficiently how the objectives/results should be achieved. The project strives to achieve improved operational cooperation and coordination, development and transfer of technology and methodology. The most important results are the final report and the seminar. The action fits within the context of current developments regarding the Pruem data exchange. Risks are that involved countries do not fully cooperate and that no improvement potentials could be found or agreed. The applicant identified relevant risks; the mitigation strategy is not really elaborated.

The methodology is appropriate. The monitoring will be carried out by a Project Steering Group which

could be considered as appropriate. The choice of partner seems to be ok. There seems to be the necessary expertise available in the project team. The expertise of the project manager cannot be assessed as this person has still to be recruited. The organisation of the project foresees that the project manager has to deal with a lot of tasks, operational and financial, what could cause the risk of overload. The project structure on the operational level (below the project manager, between the participating staff) is not sufficiently explained in the application form. The time frame is realistic. The main actions are reflected in the budget.

The project covers a regional area, but the outcome is important for all Member States. The number of EU Member States involved is satisfactory to reach the objectives. The project has a real transnational nature in terms of its impact. Clear and credible transferability potential to other MS and genuine added value for the EU policy making level.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Excellent fit with both the general ISEC programme objectives and the 2012 priorities. Convincing understanding of the broader EU policy context (SIENA, the Uniform Massaging Format 2 (UMF2) and the work concerned of Europol (involved as an associate partner) and DAPIX. Sufficiently broad, and functional partnership. Good conceptualisation. Reasonably and adequately budgeted project. Real transnational nature in terms of impact. The methodology is appropriate.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Some of the costs are not explained how they were calculated. The organisation of the project foresees that the project manager has to deal with a lot of tasks, operational and financial, what could cause a risk of overload. The project structure on the operational level (below the project manager, between the participating staff) is not sufficiently explained in the application form.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

Budgeted costs reflect the activities. The budget includes detailed information but it is not explained how some costs were calculated. The number of days for the Project Manager have been reduced by half as considered to high compared to the tasks described in the application form and as per Guide for Applicant page 30. Some costs are not supported by cost proposals (e.g. translation, information package). Cost of the study is not explained and has been reduced.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003801</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF THE SACRED HEART
<b>Project title:</b>	Assessing the Risk of the Infiltration of Organized Crime in EU MSs Legitimate Economies: a Pilot Project in 5 EU Countries
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	IT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	University of Durham (UK); Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NL); Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (SE); University of Maribor-Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security (SI)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>OBJECTIVES:</p> <p>Project ARIEL has two objectives:</p> <p>1- to develop a methodology to identify the methods used by different organized crime (OC) groups to infiltrate into legitimate economies. This methodology will be tested in 5 selected EU MS (IT, UK, NL, SE, SL)</p> <p>2- on the basis of these results, to develop a common risk-assessment model (CRAM) for detecting the infiltration of OC in legitimate economies</p> <p>ACTIVITIES:</p> <p>Project ARIEL is structured in 6 activities (see Part D - Technical Annex for details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activity 0 will organize a kick-off meeting in Milan</li> <li>- Activity 1 will analyze the state of knowledge on OC infiltration in the 5 selected EU MS legitimate economies</li> <li>- Activity 2 will collect and analyze data on socio-economic variables relevant for measuring the risk of OC infiltration in legitimate economies</li> <li>- Activity 3 will collect and analyze case studies on infiltrated companies through "script" and financial analysis</li> <li>- Activity 4 will develop a common risk-assessment model for detecting OC infiltration in legitimate economies</li> <li>- Activity 5 will organize a final public conference in Brussels to disseminate the results of the project</li> </ul> <p>DURATION: 24 months</p> <p>METHODOLOGY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At the peripheral level, research institutions/universities will be involved in the analysis of the state of knowledge on OC infiltration (Activity 1), and in the collection and analysis of socio-economic data and case studies (Activities 2-3); national LEA will be requested to participate in the meetings and provide comments and suggestions - At the central level, the Applicant will develop the common risk-assessment model (CRAM) (Activity 4) The Applicant will coordinate all the activities, organize the kick-off meeting (Activity 0) and the final conference (Activity 5), and ensure data treatment in strict compliance with EU rules as regards the protection of sensitive information</li> </ul>	



**PARTNERSHIP:**

Project ARIEL involves a research institution and a national LEA (as end user) for each of the 5 selected EU MS (IT, UK, NL, SE, SL). Europol also confirmed its interest in participating as end user, for a total of 11 actors involved in the project. The partner selection allowed to include countries in different EU macro-regions and representatives of both research institutions and law enforcement agencies

**TARGET GROUPS:**

Project ARIEL involves representatives from:

- universities and research centres (UCSC, UDUR, NSCR, Bră, FCJS)
- LEA (Europol, national LEA), as end users

The knowledge produced by Project ARIEL will also benefit:

- other EU MS LEA officers, whose representatives will be invited to a final public conference
- EU Commission and Agencies
- Civil society

**EXPECTED RESULTS AND DELIVERABLES:**

Project ARIEL will:

- provide an unprecedented cross-national comparative analysis of OC infiltration into legitimate economies in the 5 selected EU MS
- provide an analysis of the factors facilitating/promoting OC infiltration into legitimate economies
- develop an innovative common risk-assessment model for detecting OC infiltration in legitimate economies

The activities of Project ARIEL will result in 5 concrete deliverables (see Part D - Technical Annex for details):

- D1: Report describing the state of knowledge on OC infiltration in legitimate economies in the 5 selected EU MS (Activity 1)
- D2: Database containing context variables which will be used to develop a common risk-assessment model (CRAM) (Activity 2)
- D3: Report presenting the results of the analysis of the selected case studies of infiltrated companies (Activity 3). The analysis will include: script analysis, and financial and accounting analysis.
- D4: Report describing the common risk-assessment model (CRAM) and the methodology developed for its elaboration (Activity 4)
- D5: Final public conference in Brussels

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	795.248,9
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	715.724,01
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 80

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 581.683,85

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The two objectives of the project are properly defined and in line with the general objective of the ISEC programme for preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise. The project addresses the ISEC Call for Proposals 2012 priority "to stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime. The project does address a real and actual need for limiting the infiltration of organised crime in legal markets. The selected target groups and beneficiaries are appropriate for the goals to be reached.

The project plans to provide cross national comparative analysis of organised crime infiltration into legitimate economies and of the factors promoting/facilitating it as well as to develop a common risk

assessment model for detecting OC infiltration into legitimate economies. Thus the results of the project should assist all EU MS law enforcement communities in detecting the OC influence and limiting it. The indicators for measurement of the project output are relevant and verifiable. The impact to the target groups is related to establishing of common risk assessment model (CRAM) that would be as an analytical tool that should be updated by the MS themselves after the end of the project. The impact for the beneficiaries is linked to safe economic environment. The dissemination activities are appropriate and wide and include website, reports, conferences and meetings. The planned visibility of the EU funding is appropriate. The applicant has foreseen sufficient impact evaluation actions (online questionnaires, etc.). The project has a great potential to be sustained in a long term by up-dating the data and methods and disseminating them in other EU MS, however the applicant did not proposed any concrete action in order to foster this idea.

The applicant has clearly enough defined the objectives and has planned relevant actions to reach the results. The proposal is linked to one expected result from the Call for Proposals. The proposed deliverables and outputs are concrete and relevant. Although the applicant has demonstrated experience in the past and current developments in this field of action still the method of administrative approach towards fight against organised criminality also could be linked to the topic of this project. Though in general the risks defined by the applicant are grounded and the mitigation actions are appropriate, the basic risk for success of the project will be its value for political or law enforcement actions in order to tackle organised criminality.

The proposed methodology though rather costly still is adequate to reach the defined results. The applicant strives to analyse the topic in several EU MS in order to make the final product accessible for all EU MS. The applicant clearly divides the tasks between the participating countries. Still permanent Steering group would be advisable for evaluating the status and progress during the project implementation. Due to the complex nature of the topic the applicant has defined the following indicators: level of compliance with the project and quality of contributions. The chosen partners are relevant. The project proposal demonstrates sufficient expertise of the project team. The time frame though rather tight (24 months) is realistic to reach this ambitious objective. The activity related to final conference organization could be extent to more than 2 months, because it needs to be prepared, implemented and evaluated. The applicant must pay attention to not duplicate activities covered by other EU projects mentioned in section 2.1.11.

Project proposal has a strong potential to influence the EU policy in fighting the organize crime. Its results could be transferable to other EU MS. The projects structure is planned to span across the EU and as the applicant has planned already in the project implementation stage to involve several EU MS and to share the information with all other EU MS and also with candidate countries, the impact of the project would be EU wide. The number of the involved MS is sufficient and the readiness of Europol to participate in the project is also welcome.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Topicality of the problem. Good quality of the proposal. Expertise of the project team. Strong potential impact

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Value for money is not sufficiently demonstrated. The establishment of a permanent steering group for evaluation of the progress of the project implementation would be advisable.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

Value for money is not sufficiently demonstrated. 2838 working days dedicated to the project (even if many of them with no allocation) during 2 years and implementing 5 activities is a big number. No specific information is provided in each activity and related budget line: like for ex. how many researchers will work

Annex - Individual conclusion sheets for all proposals received summing up the results of evaluation

on one study/analysis in one country and how many enterprises/companies will be involved to this analysis; how many cases studies will be discussed, etc. So, without other details it is not possible to confirm the justifiability of 2838 working days, which have therefore been reduced. The rates are reasonable in connection to foreseen specific activities. Information is missing about the employment conditions – civil servants, tasks description, numbers, etc. The costs related to database and translation of financial statements have been reduced as proper justification is missing. Travel costs are not eligible for EUROPOL staff, the cost has been removed.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003824</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	GENERAL INSPECTORATE OF ROMANIAN POLICE
<b>Project title:</b>	Childhood Without Crime
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	RO
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Protection – General Direction of Child Protection (M.L.F.S.P.-G.D.C.P.) (RO); The Ministry of Interior of the Czech Republic, Crime Prevention Department (MVCR, OPK) (CZ); Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Bulgaria (Mol) (BG)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The general objective is to improve the operational and preventive capacity of the police and social services in juvenile delinquency of minors under 14.</p> <p>During the 24 months of the project, the exchange of good practice, specialist training and implementation of innovative preventive methods will be the key approaches.</p> <p>Ob.1–To develop a common work tool for the specialists in RO agencies that manage juvenile under 14 with pre- and delinquent behaviors. An exchange of experience will be facilitated during 3 study visits and will regard methods of inter-institutional cooperation and best crime prevention methods.</p> <p>Participants will draw up local diagnosis reports from each country which will be used to design the manual for the RO specialists. The manual will be elaborated by the RO partners and will include provisions for law enforcement officers, interinstitutional mechanisms, prevention best practices.</p> <p>Ob.2–To enhance the capacity of the partners to manage juveniles under 14 with pre-and delinquent behavior- training courses will be organized: TOT for 20 RO partners experts who will train 200 specialists on local level. Local training sessions will regard the manual and the public information campaign.</p> <p>Ob.3–To increase the degree of information of target groups on the prevention of criminal behavior of minors under 14 through a public information campaign. Pre- and post- campaign surveys will be conducted regarding the level of information of target groups. The campaign will have 3 components: MEDIA campaign (audio and video clip on radio and TV channels and online). SCHOOL campaign that will be implemented in 47 RO schools, classes 5-8, for 17500 students, 17500 parents, 700 educators. Partner experts will participate to meetings with educators, parents and students and will deliver presentations, disseminate informative materials and organize competitions.</p> <p>A novelty element in the campaign is the involvement of minors with antisocial behavior. Thus, in 47 schools nationwide, Crime Prevention Youth Councils (CPYC) will be created. They will be made up of teams of 10 students (5 well-behaved and 5 antisocial behaviors). Partner experts, under the coordination of school counselors, will organize team-building sessions with students. The CPYC will then coordinate preventive activities in their respective schools (contests, exhibitions) targeting their peers. Thus, by socializing and training responsibility to students, we aim at training socially acceptable behaviors to children under 14. After the project ends, the model of the CPYC can be replicated by other schools as</p>	

well.  
 ON-LINE campaign. An on line computer game will be designed in order to facilitate conflict management learning by students. Thus, the traditional ways of disseminating preventive information will be complemented by modern methods to create positive attitudes and behaviors, as it is known that children at this age are more open to learn from their peers and by playing.  
 Ob.4- Sharing expertise and best practice: the expertise gained in the project will be shared with other EU MS experts, during the international conference in Bucharest. The presentation delivered will be uploaded on the project partners and EUCPN web site.  
**EXPECTED RESULTS:**  
 3 local diagnosis reports (CZ,BG,RO) regarding prevention of juvenile delinquency of legally unaccountable minors;  
 1 manual for RO partners;  
 220 RO specialists trained;  
 1 public information campaign implemented;  
 1 international conference in RO, 10 MS invited;  
 1 best practice guide on preventing juvenile delinquency of legally unaccountable minors.  
**DISSEMINATION TO EU MS.**  
 2 press conferences,  
 1 public information campaign,  
 1 international conference, partners and EUCPN web sites.  
 The best practice guide and the informative materials of the campaign will be translated into BG, CZ, EN and disseminated to the specialists from EU MS.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	313.870
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	282.483
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 75.5  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 190.449

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The proposed objectives and outputs of the project, and its target groups and beneficiaries conform well with the priorities/expected results of the ISEC Programme and 2012 Targeted Call in so far as the applicant proposes to develop tools and methods for fighting and preventing juvenile crime and delinquency and promoting mutual cooperation amongst law enforcement and other relevant stakeholders through practitioner exchange, best practice elaboration and training exercises, coupled with a large-scale public awareness campaign. The proposed target groups and beneficiaries are relevant to be addressed by ISEC programme.

Taken at face value, this proposal sets out a multi-faceted approach to prevention in the context of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention that will deliver a series of awareness-raising interventions, and knowledge and practice resources for relevant practitioners. The manual and training initiatives proposed under the auspices of activities 4 and 6 have direct relevance to the Romanian target group such that their inherent benefits could feasibly extend beyond the lifetime of the project, albeit on a national level. The indicators proposed by the applicant are relevant to the management of project implementation but should be extended to encompass a series of additional measures to evaluate the value and impact of the interventions from the perspective of the target groups and beneficiaries.

The sustainability strategy is ambitious and well-intentioned but lacks credibility, e.g. the applicant states that the proposed best practice guide will be completed and revised in the longer term with the support and input of all EU MS but this claim is not visibly substantiated in the application documentation. Similarly, the applicant states that the Crime Prevention Youth Council model will be replicated in schools nationwide beyond the lifetime of the project but no further evidence is provided to substantiate these claims. The dissemination strategy as described lacks specificity and contains some dubious (or unsubstantiated) claims that bring its credibility into question. For example, the proposal that the project results (again unspecified) will be disseminated via the media to the entire population of Romania in a closing press conference is superficially impressive but this level of penetration is very unlikely (or at least is unsubstantiated).

The project is well-conceived with clear, feasible and well-rationalised objectives. Notwithstanding, very little evidence is presented that demonstrates the potential or utility of several key interventions proposed under the public awareness campaign, (i.e. the Crime Prevention Youth Council and online game) in the context of awareness raising, or crime prevention, e.g. any success demonstrated or identifiable in precursor projects. While the activities proposed under the online campaign/CPYC are innovative in their conception, they are also expensive and little evidence is forthcoming that would assure their utility in terms of meeting the higher-order objectives of knowledge enhancement and crime prevention. As such, it would be prudent to perform a preliminary, smaller-scale pilot to demonstrate the feasibility of these interventions before investing more heavily in an intensive national roll-out (albeit described as a pilot in the proposal).

The project risks and corresponding mitigation strategies described in the application and technical annex are credible and relevant. However, in a few cases, the identified risks do not seem to represent those with the greatest potential to compromise the integrity of the corresponding task or activity, e.g. one of the greatest risks associated with the development of a cascade training system (or “train the trainer” system) is the issue of “quality control” in the context of end delivery but this is not specified or controlled for in the application documentation. The risk of communication problems of the project team with the juveniles also should be mentioned.

The substantive content of the methodological section is quite “high-level” and lacking in task-specific methodological detail – in particular, additional methodological detail in relation to the outsourced activities would be helpful, both as an additional indicator of project quality and justification of costs. That being said, the workplan and timeline appear clear and feasible and are consistent with the tasks and resourcing detail supplied in a well-elaborated technical annex. Given the ambitious TORs of this work, the internal project monitoring strategy is credible, being firmly rooted in an explicit PM framework. However, the indicators proposed by the applicant are quite PM-centric and should encompass a series of additional measures to evaluate the value and impact of the interventions from the perspective of the target groups and beneficiaries. Given the proposal that this project will encompass a pilot of a series of measures which may latterly be transposed into other contexts, an independently-led external evaluation mechanism (conducted, for example, by a representative of the EUCPN) would be advantageous. The proposed time frame and the planned activities are well targeted to reaching the defined aim.

MS representation within the project is sufficient to deliver upon the foreseen objectives although it would appear that the substantive beneficiaries of the project activities would be Romanian. While the outcomes of the local study visits, Romanian practitioners’ manual, public awareness campaign and school intervention may be of interest to other EU MS it is unlikely that these will have any direct impact or relevance outside of the Romanian and project context – however the methodologies for intervention developed in the project and the resulting best practice guide may (subject to proof of concept) be transferrable to other EU MS, albeit with a requirement for some degree of adaptation.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Project is well-conceived with clear, feasible and well-rationalised objectives. Novel, multifaceted approach to intervention. Budget is well-elaborated and duly justified. Methodologies for intervention developed in the

project and the resulting best practice guide may (subject to proof of concept) be transferrable to other EU MS, albeit with a requirement for some degree of adaptation.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Principal benefit of the manual, accompanying trainings and public awareness campaign will be restricted to Romanian context. No apparent external evaluation mechanism forthcoming. Additional forms of approach to the juveniles could be recommended (e.g. internet social networks).

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget is well-elaborated and duly justified, corresponding with the detailed description of project tasks and resource requirements set out in the Technical Annex and supporting narrative. The costs associated with the public awareness campaign are significant and not fully justified, and have been reduced. There is a question around whether the schools campaign (e.g. the CPYC) should first be trialled and reviewed on a smaller scale before broad-based implementation occurs given the high costs associated with a preliminary roll-out to 47 schools.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003825</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	SWEDISH NATIONAL POLICE BOARD
<b>Project title:</b>	European Project for Development of Holistic Responses in Policing
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	SE
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Stockholm University (SE); National Council for Crime Prevention (SE); Ministry of Justice (SE); Polizia di Stato (IT); University of Genua (IT); Asociacion Suyae (ES); University of Lleida (ES); Autonomous University of Madrid (ES); Madrid Municipal Police (ES); Home Office (UK); Metropolitan Police Service (UK); School of Applied Social Sciences at University Campus Suffolk (UK); Mossos d'Esquadra (ES); Ministry of Security and Justice (NL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	The Swedish Tax Agency, Stockholm region (SE); The Swedish Economic Crime Authority (SE); Eurogang (SE); Telge AB (SE);
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Organised crime (OC) in its various manifestations, be it local, itinerant street gangs or sophisticated, international criminal networks, is an increasing threat to our societies. OC creates vast criminal profits from drugs trafficking, trafficking in human beings and other serious criminal activities. Even seemingly petty, but profit generating, crime such as burglaries and the sale of soda and cigarettes are connected to OC. Profits from OC often used at local level for corruption and intimidation of local population as well as for penetration of the legal economy. Overall it seriously undermines public trust, including in official institutions such as the Police. The prevention of and fight against OC is therefore a priority at national as well as at EU level.</p> <p>The Swedish National Police Board will therefore, together with several European and international partners, develop holistic responses to OC, including methods and strategies to manage and destabilize power structures and sub-groups/networks that create unrest in society and which have the ability to erode confidence in public trust. This will be done in the EPOL, European Project for the Development of Holistic Responses in Policing. EPOL will develop and implement the HOP in the prevention of and fight against OC, street gangs, pockets of radicalization in communities and in the prevention of social unrest. An overall aim of HOP is that the law enforcement agencies (LEA), as a part of its mandate, work to improve the conditions for strengthening social capital in society and strengthening society's democratic</p>	



institutions through fighting OC. EPOL will establish a network based on leading experts from both law enforcement and academia to jointly develop methods and strategies that are in line with HOP. Four focal areas have been devised in order to meet the project's objectives and aims: serious organised crime (SOC), information operations (IO), methods and research program (MRP) and European relations (ER). EPOL is not a recent effort. It builds on the successful Stockholm Gang Intervention and Prevention Project, SGIP. SGIP was an ISEC-funded project developed by the Stockholm County Police together with EU MS that developed new working methods and approaches based on scientific findings concerning the fight against OC in general and street gangs (SG) in particular. The SGIP-was finalised in August 2012.

The SGIP has resulted in the development of HOP and has been defined and implemented in operations against street gangs with a view to assess the effect of this approach on this specific criminal phenomenon. The work with SG has been carried out using the concept of PANTHER – Preventive Analysis about Network Targets for a Holistic Enforcement Response. Both the HOP approach and the PANTHER concept have achieved significant international impact and an international handbook has also been produced to further promote these ideas.

EPOL will, on the basis of SGIP, further develop and scientifically assess methods for intervention against a broader set of OC going beyond street gangs and including serious OC, mafia style organisations (MSO), pockets of radicalisation in communities and social unrest. The partnership of EPOL will be broadened and encompass partners from more EU-countries as well as the US. It is believed that the results of EPOL will be state-of-the-art anti-OC methodology. The development of methods, strategies and assessments will take place within the partnership of the project.

In policy terms, EPOL is a response to the call of Stockholm Programme to enhance the fight against OC at EU-level. EPOL is also a response to objective 1 Disrupt international crime networks of the Commission's Internal Security Strategy in Action. Finally, EPOL will, in addressing criminal networks as such rather than specific crime phenomena, be a general contribution in the context the COSI/SOCTA Policy Cycle and its Operative Action Plans.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	4.061.270,54
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	3.655.143,48
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** NOT AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 51

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The EPOL project is geared towards stimulating and promoting horizontal methods and tools to improve crime prevention and crime fighting as well as coordination among LEAs and can therefore be regarded to respond to the objectives of the call for proposals. Whether there is a need, though, for the so called holistic model that the Swedish police claims to be innovative and an international success, to be further expanded to a number of member states, seems doubtful, especially given the envisaged set-up of a large networking exercise between law enforcement and academia (and others) from just a handful of EU members states, thereby overlooking other EU or domestic approaches or research insights. For many of the objectives of the proposal, it remains unclear how they actually would be reached or link in with the project activities (e.g. strategies and methods for operational protection).

The impact of the project is very difficult to assess, since the project results seem to be of a rather academic and theoretic nature ("scientific publications", creation of a research network), while practical results for the police are limited to developing operational and investigative "methods". Even though the project may lead to policy recommendations at European level, it remains unclear how the "methodological operative package to counteract" organised crime will look like and which practical relevance it may gain.

Creating and maintaining yet another network of researchers is unlikely to yield any immediate tangible results and make a significant impact in the near future. The proposal is however quite innovative and has the positive dimension of bringing police and academia from different MS together. This may in the longer term generate new ideas in the field of policing and impact on the way how these issues are addressed in the EU.

The conceptual start-through from police approaches, academic research and networking on street gangs to OC, radicalisation etc is insufficiently reflected in the expertise brought together in the partner network and the individual research plans of the different academic institutions and academics involved. The proposal fails in indicating what exact networking activities will happen in the 4 activity clusters (the latter are basically listed; nothing more), let alone how these would lead to well-integrated outputs. The risk that the individual (academic) partners do individual exercises relating to social environment, which in themselves will prompt interesting results, without the combined activity leading to combined results, is huge. The size (person-wise) and heterogeneity (law enforcement, academia and more) of the target group involved seems to be a particular risk factor, recognised by the applicant, but lacking sufficiently credible mitigation strategies.

Apart from a division into 4 focal areas or clusters (for networking), the methodological approach remains fully undeveloped (mere listing and phasing of conferences, seminars, workshops and study visits, without detailing the actual activities that will be undertaken at these occasions, apart from liaising, networking, dialoguing). It is not articulated how results obtained will be integrated (a joint methodological approach to the scientific research is lacking). The project proposal fails to explain clearly why procurement of surveillance material is needed in the context of the project. Given the number of planned activities, the timeframe seems ambitious.

Given the budget requested, the geographical span of the partnership is far too limited. Moreover, apart from meeting up and dialoguing, there seems to be no transnational activity (partners, including academia, according to their individual research plans, are likely to conduct isolated research exercises of which it has not been anticipated how they will link in with one another or enrich one another). Hence, the likeliness for the project to prompt integrated results in the end, is very low, let alone that these would be useful for the entirety of the EU or a robust basis for building EU policies on.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The belief that interaction between law enforcement and academia can lead to enhanced insights and improved approaches. Intrinsically qualified partners and staff

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Too large-scale. Too expensive. Too self-centred. Poor risk mitigation strategy. Too few member states involved, given the budget. Unacceptably expensive. Many unacceptable budget items. Poor (short term) impact prospects. Underdeveloped methodology. Unlikely to prompt integrated results.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget seems to be comprehensive and covers the various activities planned for in the application. It is however not convincing that this project is "good value for money" not only because of the large amount of money which is sought from the Commission but also with regard to the fact that the project seems to be more a large research and travel project (with major staff- and travel costs for a series of conferences and workshops all over Europe) to which a small operational component and a major procurement part of 0,5 MEUR (purchase of IMSI-catcher, night vision equipment etc.) have been added. Project is too expensive with regard to travel and staff costs in proportion to expected results. Procurement and subcontracted costs are not sufficiently explained.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003826</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	FEDERAL CRIMINAL POLICE OFFICE GERMANY
<b>Project title:</b>	International Symposium 2013 and 2014 for Bomb Investigators and Bomb Disposal Experts
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	DE
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Helsinki Police Department, IEDD/CBRNE (FI); Hungarian Bomb Disposal Service (HU); Athens Bomb Squad (GR); Belgian EOD Service (BE); Bund Deutscher Feuerwerker & Wehrtechniker e.V. (DE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The project is meant to be an integrating event. The concept envisages an interdisciplinary presentation of expert contributions, from which, through illustrating problems and launching discussions, a solution to the complex tasks linked with explosives and incendiary crimes shall be developed. For this reason, themes related to the areas of crime scene work and investigations, forensic science and research as well as legal problems and trends will be dealt with.</p> <p>Focal contributions will address the development of new evidence recovery techniques, the application and further development of new methods of evidence recovery, problem areas in case processing, management of operational sites, tactics and the advancement of techniques for the deactivation of improvised explosive and incendiary devices as well as changes and trends in the threat situation and possibilities of suppression.</p> <p>Besides organizing the core events, it is furthermore planned to have a non-profit organisation i. e. the "BDFWT e. V " provide the participants with an overview of the current range of operational equipment and technology currently available for investigating explosives and incendiary crime scenes and for Bomb Disposal. In addition, the two symposia are intended to complement each other from a thematic perspective. In this respect, it is planned to invite all the project partners to a meeting in the first quarter of 2013 for the purpose of evaluating the programme and review of the 2012 event and incorporating these as a concrete element of the 2013 event.</p> <p>The concept of these conferences is to "train the trainer". The participants are considered to act as multipliers in their home countries. The knowledge shared by the speakers will lead to best practice in the sensitive working fields of Bomb Disposal and Bomb Investigation not only in the EU, but also in the other attending countries.</p> <p>The symposia are a joint undertaking by investigators and bomb disposal experts to achieve an important goal: the different focuses of the executive measures implemented by the bomb disposal experts (keywords: assessment of the threat situation and aversion of danger as quickly as possible) and the investigators (keywords: collection of physical evidence) in practice lead to a conflict of interests which shall be minimized by this event. The symposia are user-oriented and unique in Europe.</p>	

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	255.169
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	229.652,10
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 76.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 225.794,61

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The project main objective is in line with ISEC Programme goals to stimulate, promote and develop horizontal methods and tools necessary for strategically preventing and fighting crime and guaranteeing security and public order and also to promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies. Main objective of the project is to exchange practices among explosives experts which is in line with Call priority to improve the capabilities of the Member States and relevant international organisations to prepare for, detect and respond to CBRN incidents. This is fully in line with EU CBRN Action Plan to promote projects whose goal is to enhance the security of explosives or to deal with the threats from improvised explosive devices and the precursors. This a real need at EU level as it would enhance preparedness to tackle CBRN threats and incidents. All presented results are clear and are relevant for ISEC programme objectives.

The impact of this project on ISEC programme general objective is to be considered as medium term. Main goal of the project is to ensure continuity to the International Symposium for bomb investigators and bomb disposal experts during 2014 and 2015. This type of networking initiatives are envisaged on EU CBRN Action Plan as it will allow to update experts on current trends and threats emanating from explosives, bombs and incendiary devices. The project main output is the minutes of the symposium in which all experts experience is gathered. Number of participants is main indicator for evaluation, but the quality of the contents of the event and also the satisfaction degree from participants should also be taken into account. Target group is not only LEAs from EU MS but also military experts and emergency services from EU and from candidate and third countries. Dissemination strategy is limited to the sensitiveness of the issue and it is based on a DVD to be given to each participant. The project sustainability is not based on concrete facts or measures, on the contrary it is assumed by the applicant that the project is to be continued on the basis of ISEC support. Some alternatives should be proposed in order to open other funding options. If awarded the project should be evaluated in terms of the sustainability of the project in the medium term, the capacity to ensure real updating of experts and the involvement of third parties in order to get profit from the knowledge of private security environment.

Preparation phase and execution phase are clearly described, identifying main results to be achieved, which in fact is to ensure the celebration of the two symposia and a good choice of the topics to be touched upon. This action fits in past alike symposia and aims to ensure continuity based on the success of previous events. Information regarding outputs and deliverables is not satisfactory provided within the technical annex (number of days, number of trainings/workshops, number of participants, number of minutes/DVD, etc.). However, the overall results set-up in the application form are clear. The applicant has identified very general risks linked to the availability of key experts and fixing of proper dates and location. Risk mitigation strategy is in line with main risks identified by the applicant, nevertheless success from previous alike events makes this project likely to be efficiently achieved.

The proposed methodology is adequate to achieve the main result which is to organise to next two

international events on bomb devices and bomb disposal experts. These two international events are to be considered the best way to bring together experts from different countries and security areas ensuring the needed degree of confidentiality. Monitoring will be done by the coordinating team but the applicant has not detailed how this will be done, so it is difficult to assess if this monitoring is appropriate or not. Indicators on the outputs are based on participants' impressions from the event, number of participants, networking and contacts among different stakeholders. These indicators are to be considered the typical ones when dealing with conference based projects. Choice of partners is adequate according to the experience on CRBN issues but also as far as security and international cooperation matters are concerned. Time frame is realistic and provides enough anticipation to organise properly both multinational events.

The project proposal aims to cover as many experts as possible not only from EU MS but also candidate countries and relevant third countries. In this sense this project is a real transnational project not only in terms of number of participants but also as far as the number of chosen partners is concerned. As this is a continuation of previous conferences, the potential transfer to other countries is clear and upgrading minutes from previous events is ensured.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Clear methodology, good preparation, real transnational nature, conformity with ISEC programme and EU CRBN Action Plan plus Action Plan on Explosives Security.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

For the risk identification and strategy, a less optimistic approach should be given. Some key points on the budget are unclear.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

Technical annex is very brief, it described all activities in a very general way. Nevertheless all activities are reflected in the budget. The amount of the sought is proportionate as the main output is to organise two multinational expert conferences. Generally speaking the budget is adjusted and balanced to achieve the main purpose of the project but some headings include incomplete or unclear data. Staff costs are zero but key information on number of days assigned to staff would have been needed in order to assess if the total number of hours is enough to ensure the success of the project.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003827</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF SECURITY AND JUSTICE
<b>Project title:</b>	FORMERS AND FAMILY: involving family-members of extremists in countering radicalisation and supporting de-radicalisation
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	NL
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Ministry of Social Affairs and Integration (DK); Home Office (UK)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>One of the most difficult and neglected areas of counter-radicalisation is the involvement of the family of radicalized individuals. Little is known about the preventive or enabling role that parents, siblings and other relations play in the radicalisation and de-radicalisation process of extremists. Less even is known about engaging them in interventions.</p> <p>The objective of this project is to involve family members of radicalising youth in countering extremism. Focus is on Islamic and right-wing former extremists, as these are easier to reach than extremists still in the process. In addition, formers have often reconciled with their family, which means that the family can better reflect on the (de-) radicalisation process of the extremist member. This provides useful information on the role of the family, which has not been systematically gathered before.</p> <p>The project runs for 24 months and includes: (a) research; (b) development of policy-guidelines and (c) practical tools for professionals and civil society.</p> <p>The methodology is a combination of field study (interviews/analysis), in-depth policy discussion and development of tools with practitioners.</p> <p>Participants are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Governments of the Netherlands, Denmark and Great-Britain.</li> <li>- a head researcher and 3 researchers (from these countries);</li> <li>- around 120 individuals interviewed (15 islamist and 15 right-wing former extremists and at least 2 family members of each);</li> <li>- the members of the Policy Planners Network for Radicalisation (PPN - NL, DEN, GB, SW, GER, BEL, SP, FR), any other European government that wishes to join the PPN-meetings; members of EU Council and Commission working groups.</li> <li>- 50 members of at least 2 working groups of the EC's Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), who will disseminate to civil society and professional practitioners;</li> <li>- project leaders of related projects in Europe, i.e. SAFIRE, FAST, RECORA, FORUM, and radicalisation mentoring projects in Denmark, Sweden and Norway.</li> </ul> <p>Expected results are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least 30 case-studies (10 per country).</li> <li>2. An analysis of the role of family members in preventing radicalisation and supporting de-radicalisation of violent extremists, plus advice on how communities and professionals can support such families.</li> <li>3. A policy paper with guidelines on policies with regard to involving families.</li> <li>4. A practical toolbox with:</li> </ol>	

- training module for front-line professionals (i.e. youth and family support, schools) and community organisations.  
 - Guidelines for family interventions (including a counter-narrative tool)  
 - family mentoring guidelines  
 - family case management information systems, including risk assessment tool  
 5. a "family hub" on-line facility (on the RAN-website) for families and practitioners with forums and supporting material (i.e. stories, counter-narrative tips, guidelines for intervention, and contact details for expertise and support in various Member States);  
 The dissemination strategy involves:

- partnership of NL, DEN and UK, involving their professional and civil society networks;
- in depth discussion of guidelines and tools with EU-countries (in meetings of PPN and RAN working-groups (i.e. prison& probation, local government); and with working groups of the Commission and Council;
- linking with relevant European projects, i.e. ENER, SAFIRE, the Danish de-radicalisation project; the U.K. project on prisons and probation, existing networks of former-extremists and the MPower Foundation (leading UK ngo for family and parenting).
- placing project-results and the 'family hub' on the RAN-website; making maximum use of other RAN dissemination possibilities, i.e. working-group meetings, RAN- newsletter, policy meetings and the network of the Committee of the Regions.
- A end-conference of policy makers, practitioners, community figures, with former extremists and family members.
- Ensuring continuity through a network of contact figures and a strategy for exchange and product maintenance

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	371.934
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	334.740
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 81  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 319.573,48

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The proposed programme of work demonstrates good conformity with priority 2 of the Targeted call for Framework Partners, but moreover services all four priorities of the 2012 Targeted Call on Radicalisation Leading to Terrorism and the Protection of Victims of Terrorism. In addition this programme of activity would make an important contribution to the ongoing work of the Radicalisation Awareness Network and timely development of evidence based, "what works" approaches in the context of counterradicalisation as per the priorities indicated by the Head of the Commission's Counter-terrorism Unit.

The impact potential of this project is high; the project proposes the development of a suite of disparate, evidence-led interventions all focused on building the capacity of key actors such as families and community/professional practitioners to engage in the counterradicalisation of Islamist and right-wing extremists. This potential is enhanced by a robust dissemination strategy. Concrete sustainability provisions are made to continue the stream of project benefits beyond the lifetime of the project across all of the relevant stakeholder groups. The proposal is clear and well presented and lists 5 expected results which seem to be realistic and achievable in such a research oriented project. Apart from the case studies which may inspire further research/analysis, the most important result of the project would be the "practical toolbox" which could be used by frontline staff as well as concerned family members. By the applicant's

own admission the scope of the research is not extended to all partner countries, but there is a need to prioritise the requirement for rich, in-depth and contextualised understanding of (counter)radicalisation dynamics over the geographical representativeness of the findings. This should be seen as a strength rather than an inherent weakness in the design of the proposal as it will allow for richer, multifaceted understanding of the role of the family in (counter)radicalisation and higher quality, evidence based interventions. The project risks and corresponding mitigation strategies described in the application are credible and relevant – however these are largely absent in the technical annex at the level of individual project activities.

While the project objectives, tasks, results and deliverables are well-delineated in the proposal, less detail is forthcoming around the supporting methodologies in the application form and in the technical annex (although project management methodologies are well-described). This is an inherent deficiency in this proposal as it is difficult to evaluate whether the methodologies that will be employed in this project have the scope to produce the ambitious project deliverables proposed within the project timeframe, or whether the requested budget is justified. Outline details of the methods that will be employed in each task (e.g. a summary of the research design that is envisaged to conduct the case studies) should be provided to justify the budget requested and provide some assurances around the feasibility/equality of the envisaged deliverables. The project evaluation strategy is clear and credible, comprising internal and external evaluation mechanisms that are proposed to operate in a short, medium and longer term capacity – however the supporting indicators for external evaluation, while named (e.g. “usefulness” and “accessibility”) should be defined in more detail to evidence their relevance. The envisaged project management strategy, in particular, is well-elaborated which is an important feature given the ambitious terms of reference and broad scope of this work, as well as the requirement to outsource a pivotal work strand (i.e. the empirical research on counterradicalisation) to an external research team.

The very profile of the participant group, which comprises representatives from 14 states in the EEA, demonstrates the pan-European relevance of this project and potential value and impact of its envisaged outputs. The proposal to produce a series of tools and knowledge and information resources that would be used by policymakers, professionals and families in other countries and beyond the financing period is credible given that mutual pan-European cooperation on this project will be fostered under the auspices of the European PPN (with the involvement of other countries from SE Europe), RAN and other multi-national networks (such as Google, SAVE). The emergent tools and resources have the potential to be transposed into other, or all European countries, subject to requirement, given that the policy paper and practitioner tools will be elaborated and tested with transnational policy-maker/practitioner input.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Project objectives, activities and envisaged outputs are thoroughly scoped and defined and well-grounded in knowledge gaps identified in the extant literature and in the expressed needs of key European policy/practitioner fora. Pan-European relevance of project deliverables is well-established; high conformity with current ISEC priorities. Strong dissemination and sustainability strategies.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Methodological detail at the level of individual project activities (e.g. the case study research) is lacking. Aspect of budget (e.g. salaries, subcontracting costs) insufficiently justified.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

Daily rates for project manager (specifically employed civil servant) have been lowered to 450 euro per day. Subcontracting costs associated with the research component are very high and as such, salary costs and the resource requirement for this work should be justified through the provision of offers and a methodological description (e.g. TORs for the research, overview of the research design, etc.).



PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003828</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	POLICE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE MOI OF LT
<b>Project title:</b>	Implementation of the Smart Cross-Border Cooperation Model
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (LT); The Voivodship Headquarters of the Police in Bialystok, Poland (PL); Podlaski Border Guard Regional Unit (PL); State Police of Latvia of the Ministry of the Interior (LV); The State Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia (LV); Estonian Police and Border Guard Board (EE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The main aim of this Project is to contribute to the security of European Community by strengthening the capacities of police and border guard (BG) officers of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to cooperate in combating cross-border crimes by the implementation of the smart cross-border cooperation model, which will consist of complex of practical measures (including trainings) and strengthening of the cooperation at different levels of management (heads of the institutions, heads of the public order police, heads of the criminal police, heads of the border guard services and officers of territorial levels). Project foresees 4 types of activities - development of the common curricula's, material, practical scenarios for the training; trainings; seminars for cooperation and problems analysis at different levels of management; dissemination &amp; visibility:</p> <p>I) Development of the common curricula's: this activity will include the preparation of training programs and material for joint patrols training and preparation of the material and practical training scenarios for the cross-border operations' training. 6 workshops for the coordination of the development of the above material is foreseen (2 – LT/PL, 2 – LT/LV and 2 – LV/EE) with 8 experts (both from police and BG, 4 from each country) in each.</p> <p>II) Trainings: in total 16 trainings (2 types) will be performed:</p> <p>1) training of police and BG officers to perform joint patrol: 8 trainings (2- LT/PL, 3 – LT/LV and 3 – LV/EE), it will be (3 days) trainings with the theoretical and practical parts, 20 participants in each (10 from each country);</p> <p>2) training of police and BG officers to cooperate in other cross border operations: 8 trainings (2- LT/PL, 3 – LT/LV and 3 – LV/EE), it will be (4 days) trainings with the theoretical, practical parts and table exercises to cooperate in different types of cross border operations (such as hot pursuit, crisis situation, etc.), 20 participants in each (10 from each country).</p> <p>III) Seminars for analysis of cooperation and problems at different levels of management: this activity will include annual working seminars (28 in total) for the analysis of the cooperation in the field of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• policing in general (2 seminars, 12 participants from all partner countries in each);</li> <li>• public order police activity area (2 seminars, 12 participants from all partner countries in each);</li> <li>• criminal police activity area (2 seminars, 12 participants from all partner countries in each);</li> </ul>	

- BG activity area (2 seminars, 12 participants from all partner countries in each);
- territorial level (4 LT/PL seminars, 10 LT/LV seminars and 6 LV/EE seminars with 6 participants from the police and BG officers in each).

IV) Dissemination & visibility: 2 conferences will be held - Opening and Closure conferences, 2 days long each (with 24 participants from all partner countries + project staff). All information about the aims, activities of the Project will be presented in Opening Conference, as well as the results and outcomes of the Projects will be presented in Closure Conference.

Implementation of the SCBC model will be summarized, conclusions and recommendations for further cooperation will be presented on internet pages of partners and published in booklet (in all languages of partners + in EN).

More than 530 participants will take part in the Project (320 – in trainings, 108 in seminars for the analysis of the cooperation and problems, 48 – in workshops for the development of the material, 8 - in summarizing of implementation of SCBC model and 48 – in the conferences). All in all, 80 Polish, 163 Lithuanian, 186 Latvian and 103 Estonian police and BG officers will participate in the Project.

To ensure proper quality of the implementation of the Project, Project Steering Group will be established, which will consist of Project Manager, Assistants, Financial Coordinators, Translators, as well as Coordinators of Programs and Project Events in each partner country.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	486.353
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	451.953
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	92,93

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 77.5  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 412.063,20 (90% co-financing accepted)

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

Project idea and proposal itself represents a professional and pertinent action with an immediate impact on the EU territory on EU external eastern borders. The project objectives and results are fully in line with the aims and priorities of the Call for proposals and Internal Security Strategy, especially as far as operational law enforcement cooperation is concerned. The project addresses the priority of operational law enforcement cooperation. It meets a real/actual need as cooperation gaps have been identified. The need for closer cooperation is highlighted for example in the Stockholm Programme which has a high priority. The target group is very relevant. The applicants drafted all activities in a comprehensible, logical and practical way and are relevant for ISEC programme objectives.

The impact of this project in the short and medium term will be a closer cooperation between police and border guards in the participating countries, in the long term an increase in security for the citizens. There are indicators mentioned that will allow the measurement of the project output. They are relevant and verifiable. The impact of this project could be measured by the monitoring of the number of joint actions between police and border guards and between the participating countries. The proposed dissemination strategy is adequate. Sustainability and the description of the continuation of benefits after the period of ISEC financing has ended is described only generally; no strategy and any concrete measure are foreseen by applicant.

The proposal explains clearly how the objectives should be reached and the results achieved. All activities proposed within the application (technical annex) are well foreseen and can through their content and methodology achieved the expected results. Results, outputs and deliverables are well developed. This project fits well within the context of past and current developments regarding improving law enforcement

cooperation. It makes use of a previous ISEC project and takes into account what has been already achieved. Definitions of potential risks, assumptions and mitigation strategies are well set-up within the application form and they are appropriate. Project proposal innovative aspect is based on Smart CBC model; nevertheless it could be described more deeply.

Proposed methodology is well developed. All activities are foreseen in line with project and programme objectives. Content of the activities could be more deeply developed. The number of seminars (28) within the activity N. 6 seems to be too high without sufficient justification especially in connection to act. 6.13 – 6.28 (10 + 6 seminars – 2 different CBC). Time frame is realistic and logically set-up in accordance with all project organizational structure, however it could be recommended to extent some activities like for ex.: trainings from 1 to at least 3 months (preparation, implementation and evaluation). The choice of partners is appropriate and distribution of tasks among the partners is well balanced. There seems to be sufficient expertise in the project team. There are indicators that will allow the measurement of the projects output, they are relevant and verifiable.

Project proposal concerns directly 4 EU countries on external eastern EU border that are involved to project activities. It concerns indirectly the majority of EU MS, because the effects of developed cross-border cooperation in Baltic region could bring new methods in fighting the potential organize crime threats from third countries. All proposed results if they will be used as the applicant designed, could have an important transferability potential to the whole EU.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The objectives of the project are properly defined and in line with the general objectives of the ISEC programme. The target group is very relevant. Good impact prospects. Methodology is appropriate. There are indicators that will allow the measurement of the projects outputs, they are relevant and verifiable. Good partnership.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Content of the activities could be more deeply developed, number of seminars of activity N. 6 is not justified. There is not always an explanation on what basis the costs are calculated. Dissemination strategy is based on 3 different tools, however there is not clear mention about the dissemination of the results to other EU MS except the internet. Sustainability and the description of the continuation and streaming the benefits after the period of ISEC financing has ended is very weakly described (only generally).

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

All activities are precisely linked with relevant budget lines. Seminars under act. 6.13 – 6.28 have been reduced to 8 + 4 and staff daily rates has been adjusted. Subcontracting is foreseen in the budget calculation for the evaluation/audit certificate, but is not mentioned in the application form. The offers or price calculation were not submitted, however the price seems to be adequate.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003829</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR OF THE SR
<b>Project title:</b>	Enhancement of exchange of forensic information among law enforcement agencies
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	SK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Institute of Criminalistics Prague (CZ); Central Forensic Laboratory of the Police (PL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Objective To promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, other national authorities and related Union bodies</p> <p>Activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TRIADA workshops (12 workshops SK/CZ/PL, 3 days/2 nights each, 8 forensic experts for a meeting) - Training of and other exchanges among law enforcement officers (18 months)</li> <li>2. Electronic magazine EXPERT - creation of focused on forensic science, operational police practices, methods, crime scene experience, police work, any relevant information in connection with LEOs case work, exchange of information for law enforcement purposes (12 months)</li> </ol> <p>Supporting activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. procurement and purchase of HW and SW necessary for electronic magazine (4 months)</li> <li>4. development of LEA platform for information exchange (12 months)</li> </ol> <p>Duration: 24 months</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>The structures regulating the implementation of the project are given by the standards regulating the FSI and by project management principles. These principles will be obligatory for all involved members of the project team during the whole period of project implementation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In case of subcontracting, procurement will be realized according to the legislation of Slovak Republic, contract with supplier will be signed by representative of Mol.</li> <li>2. To implement the submitted project, a project team has been established consisting of project manager, financial manager and team members. This team will secure everyday implementation of the project, communication with target groups by standard channels of Mol. Superiority and subordination relations result from the actual organization structure of the Mol and FSI PC, system of valid documentation and process structure.</li> </ol> <p>Partnership: CZ, PL</p> <p>Target groups: Law enforcement officials and forensic experts</p> <p>Expected results: 12 workshops for 96 participants: 64 forensic experts, 32 LEOs (32/SK, 32/CZ, 32/PL)</p> <p>LEA platform for information exchange,, available to all law enforcement officers and forensic experts electronically, and electronic magazine EXPERT</p> <p>Deliverables:</p> <p>Reports from the workshops</p> <p>Guideline for EXPERT/LEA usage (How to use it)</p>	

Annex - Individual conclusion sheets for all proposals received summing up the results of evaluation

Dissemination strategy: - information about the project and its activities during 11th International Forensic Symposium in Bratislava in September 2013 will be disseminated among participants - on web page of IFS information with contacts and invitation for other experts to join discussion forum during project will be published - the report will be published on IFS web site - Guideline will be distributed to the partners and their cooperating agencies if necessary	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	185.527,24
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	176.227,24
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	94,99

**CONCLUSION:** REJECTED (double of HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003836)

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003830</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	SERIOUS ORGANISED CRIME AGENCY
<b>Project title:</b>	International Specialist Law Enforcement
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	UK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Bundeskriminalamt (BKA) (DE); Commissioner-General Special Units (CGSU) (BE); National Bureau of Investigation (NBI) (FI); Garda (GIE) (IE); Carabinieri (ROS) (IT); Korps Landelijke Politiediensten (KLPD) (NL); Criminal Police Directorate (CPD) (SI); Cuerpo Nacional de Policía (CNP) (ES); Bundesministerin (BMI) (AT); Special Service for National Security (SSNS) (HU); Groupe d'Intervention de la Gendarmerie Nationale (GIGN) (FR); Gathering Intelligence Unit (GIU) (CZ)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP); Police of Norway (NO); EUROPOL (EU)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational

**Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):**

Objectives over two year period:

1. Expand on existing partnerships and create new ones to promote and develop Specialist Techniques used by MS law enforcement bodies;
2. Collate and consolidate existing specialist data into a standard format that will enable the creation and sharing of information;
3. Improve knowledge and education in Specialist Techniques by identifying common curricular, coordinating existing educational facilities and establishing secure communication methods; and 4. Implement an agreed control strategy with shared responsibility and engagement in achieving a long-term program of activity toward the development of Specialist Techniques.

Activities

- Involve an increasing number of participating Member States and Organisations within those states;
- Develop communications between specialist practitioners through Europol EPE;
- Collate and consolidate existing specialist information;
- Coordinate the creation and sharing of new information;
- Enable specialist training with common curricular;
- Coordinate workshops and exchanges to identify best practice and share knowledge; and
- Coordinate regular meetings to enhance cooperation and development opportunities.

Structure:

- Participants will include EUROPOL and comprise of an increasing number of law enforcement organisations from European Member States;
- The Project Manager will be appointed by the lead organisation (SOCA);
- The group will be led by an accountable, decision-making Steering Group appointed by the Project

<p>Manager;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Steering Group will ensure established Terms of Reference are provided, including objectives and expected outcomes to each Work Group to provide clarity of direction and coordination of activity; and</li> <li>• Secure communication and coordination of activity will be through EUROPOL Platform for Experts (EPE).</li> </ul> <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Steering Group will coordinate participating partners into Work Groups, each led by a Steering Group member;</li> <li>• Work Group activities will be identified from needs assessment by the Steering Group and outcomes from other activities;</li> <li>• Activities will focus on developing common practices and identifying sharing opportunities between Member States, including education opportunities or best practice with a Pan European scope;</li> <li>• Particular attention will be focussed on ensuring appropriate training, equipment and machinery is accessible;</li> <li>• Identified best practice will be developed through an exchange programme between participants;</li> <li>• Regular meetings of all participants will reinforce established partnerships, create new ones and enable sharing of more sensitive issues;</li> <li>• All activities and their effectiveness will be monitored by the Steering Group;</li> <li>• Outcomes will be measurable by an increased number of participants, the level of information exchanged using EPE and the amount of specialist education shared; and</li> <li>• Outcomes will be shared through EPE and at annual conferences.</li> </ul> <p>Updates of all activity will be accessible to all participants throughout Europe via EPE. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of scheduled activities;</li> <li>• Outcomes from activities;</li> <li>• Circulation of development opportunities;</li> <li>• All meeting agendas and minutes;</li> <li>• Final reports to EC.</li> </ul>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	359.244
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	323.244
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,98

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 75.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 286.193,42

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The applicant has defined several objectives of the project that include expanding of the existing partnerships, promoting of cooperation, improvement of knowledge and education and establishment of a long -term program of activity toward joint development of Specialist Techniques. The objective is clear and properly defined and in line with the general objective of the ISEC programme and the priorities of the ISEC Call for Proposals. The project does address real and actual need for development of cooperation between the experts in Specialist Techniques in order to create solid grounds for everyday cooperation and to raise awareness about the methods possible for this law enforcement action. The target group seems to be the exactly right one for the envisaged project (even if limited in size).

As defined by the applicant the project aims at reinforcing operational law enforcement cooperation and specialist capability. This aim is in direct relation with the general objective of the ISEC programme for fight against crime. In long term the created cooperation network will facilitate further cooperation especially with involvement of Europol Platform of Experts. Thought the applicant has described the indicators for measurement of the projects outputs they should be elaborated in more detail and should be more

verifiable. The created cooperation platform that will be supported by Europol Platform of Experts will provide continuation of the stream of benefits after the period of external support has ended. Due to the specific topic of the project the dissemination actions are targeted at rather limited audience of law enforcement communities. The involvement of Europol will provide the sharing of the respective knowledge to other EU MS not participating in the project. The impact measurement indicators are relevant, given the envisaged activity.

The applicant has clear vision and plan for reaching the defined objectives. The most important results of the project are: establishment of common training curricula, organised workshops and conference and established longer programmes. The deliverables and outputs could be elaborated in more detail. The applicant has taken into account the developments in the field of Specialist Techniques and inter alia plans to conduct needs assessment in the use of Specialist Techniques by national law enforcement organisations across Europe. Risk factors have been properly assessed, and seem to be controllable.

The proposed methodology is adequate to reach the expected objectives. Proposed actions are functional, even if the precise needs assessment has not happened (and will be part of the activity at the level of the steering group). The topic of Specialist Techniques and its confidential nature does not allow to use a wide range of actions, the actions should be very targeted and limited towards the specific law enforcement structures. Adequate specialist partnership with broad span throughout the EU, including Europol as an associate partner. The indicators for measurement of projects output could be elaborated in more detail in order to facilitate the evaluation of the projects implementation. The proposed time frame is realistic. The proposed actions are well planned and sufficiently reflected in the budget.

Genuine transnational project, both in terms of envisaged activities and foreseeable impact. The project partnership spans broadly throughout the EU. The planned involvement of Europol will provide the distribution of the results of the project to all the EU MS. The impact of the project will be improvement of Specialist Techniques work carried out by law enforcement and also improvement of transnational cooperation possibilities and building of trust among these special teams of law enforcement.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Relevant and focused project (through its address of special technique experts and practitioners throughout the EU). Adequate partnership, broadly spanning throughout the EU and including Europol. Moderate, functional budgeting. Reasonably good impact and sustainability prospects.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

An exact (specialist, sensitive or intrusive training and information/communication) needs assessment has not happened yet.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs in the budget do reflect the activities planned. The amount of grant sought is proportionate to the importance of the specific issue. The provided forecast budget calculation provides information about the planned expenses but could have been elaborated more precisely in accordance with the Guide for Applicants. The column "Activity" is not filled in the budget form. DSA for Canada has been modified in accordance to official rates and error in line 54 has been corrected. Explanation on line 53 is to be provided. Costs for finding new partners (announced but not named in the application form) have been removed as this cost should be covered by the applicant. Audit report has been added.



PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003831</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF SECURITY AND JUSTICE
<b>Project title:</b>	Unfolding Unrest: signals en intervention. European working Conference on Social Disorder
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	NL
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	6
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Federal Public Service Home Affairs - DG Centre of Crisis (BE); The Home Office, Public Order Unit (UK);
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The project "Unfolding Unrest: signals en intervention. European working Conference on Social Disorder" aims at organizing a interdisciplinary working-conference in May 2013 on large-scale public disorder. Representatives of National Crisis centres, Police organizations and policymakers will exchange experiences and learn from the approach in 7 EU-countries: the UK, France, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Greece and the Netherlands. Objective is to prevent the occurrence of large scale public disorder and to effectively tackle and de-escalate such disorder when it occurs.</p> <p>Each country will send 6-9 participants (2-3 for each discipline) to participate in the working-conference and to form a network that can secure the continuing exchange of experiences. Furthermore, the network can be used by other EU-countries to gather information.</p> <p>Programme:</p> <p>First day: Participants arrive and check into Hotel New York, Rotterdam. Introductory meeting. Focus of this day is on problem analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Start of the day is a case study in working groups, where the representatives of each country will discuss how the case would be dealt with within their country.</li> <li>- After lunch there will be a plenary presentation by a scientist on recent developments and their implications on social order. For example the effects of the economic crisis and the fact that social growth is very unlikely for the next generation. Professor Waddington, Head of the Communication &amp; Computing Research Centre at Sheffield Hallam University, UK has confirmed as speaker.</li> <li>- The second plenary presentation will be on new forms of mass mobilization through the use of social media. Special attention will be paid to youth groups.</li> <li>- The afternoon will be concluded by a panel discussion on both presentations and on the (im-)possibilities of predicting large scale social disorder.</li> </ul> <p>The evening will start with a welcome of the mayor of the city of Rotterdam (Mr. A. Aboutaleb, date is confirmed in his agenda) to the participants and will be followed by a dinner in the hotel.</p> <p>Second day: Focus of this day is on intervention strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plenary presentation on the possibilities of early intervention</li> <li>- First round of workshops. The participants can choose from 4 workshops (1. social media as an instrument for governments, 2.</li> <li>- crisis communication (role of framing and the use of crisis communication for crowd control), 3. local networks, 4. tracking down and prosecution)</li> <li>- lunch</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- second round of workshops. The same workshops will be given.</li> <li>- Plenary speech on the role of policing (both as a trigger and to discuss effective intervention styles)</li> <li>- All participants will discuss the case of the first day to re-evaluate their approach and to see if they have achieved new insights during the conference that they can apply.</li> <li>- Closing of the conference</li> </ul> <p>Lessons from this exchange will be made public in a digital folder that will be available to all EU-member states. In cooperation with the partners involved, the list of speakers will be made official.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	111.334
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	100.184
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,99

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 71  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 94.564,60

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

Project proposal is in line with ISEC objectives, the Call for proposals and Internal Security Strategy by its focus on the prevention of and approaches in relation to large-scale public disorder. Presented results especially “network of professionals” are comprehensible and are relevant for ISEC programme objectives. The target group involved seems to be exactly fit for the envisaged project (even if limited to only 7 member states). The total number of participants is adequate in connection to the budget and activities. Applicant based his proposal on real previous experiences in the field and needs identified by different partners. The proposal is also grounded on different researches done in past years.

Reasonably good prospects of effectively delivering added value on the level of the 7 MS involved (and ultimately beyond, building on the initial network to be established via the project). The impact measurement indicators are relevant, given the envisaged activity (mounting an initial 7 member-state-network through the organisation of an interdisciplinary international conference). The dissemination strategy is set-up and addresses a wide scale of beneficiaries and professionals through different networks. It would be suitable to provide more details about the dissemination strategy and not only to have some digital folders with learned lessons from the conference to be disseminated. A multiplication strategy is not provided by applicant at all. It is not enough to mention the spreading out of results through the existing networks. Concrete example of the multiplication action during the project implementation or ex-post is missing.

The project proposal follows up on previous developments related to fight against radicalisation. The proposal is clear in pointing out how the objectives will be reached, and on what the outcomes and results will be. However some parts of the application form could be developed more deeply. Project proposal shows its original innovative basis in 2 mains aspects (the emphasis on signalling, preventing and de-escalating riots instead of only combatting them and accent on social media). The applicant has well set-up the risk and assumptions for successful implementation of the project in the AF; however the mitigation strategies are not sufficiently developed within the technical annex.

The proposed actions are functional, as is the partnership (even if limited to only 3 member states). The conference programme and organisation have been sufficiently prepared. All activities are designed in connection with project and programme objectives and their content and extent is coherent with proposed

budget and general strategy. Time frame is realistic and logically and hierarchically set-up in accordance with all project organizational structure. Partners represent relevant bodies with professional expertise and lots of experience with EU funded projects. Task distribution is adequate. Project managers and all proposed staff are qualified. The monitoring and evaluation strategy was set-up.

The partnership network being limited to 3 member states, the activity will involve relevant partners from 7 member states. Given the moderate grant requested and the potential of the initial expert network/forum to be relevant for other member states, the European added value is clearly sufficient. The particular focus on getting more (shared) interdisciplinary knowledge on the influence of social media in relation to crowd control and mass communication makes the activity quite innovative, with intrinsic transferability potential.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Simple, straightforward project with innovation and transferability potential, adequately budgeted.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

A multiplication strategy is not provided. Some information is missing in the budget.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

All activities reflect foreseen budget break-down within the context of each place of the implementation. Value for money is demonstrated and budget calculation is realistic, however, some costs must to be clarified. Staff costs seem adequate in relation of foreseen tasks. The salary costs must to be reviewed. In some cases, the rate of remuneration is higher than the reference values in the guide for applicants (500 EUR). Travel costs are relevant and necessary for fulfilment of the tasks. Not enough information is provided in connection to organizational costs – only the lump sum (8.666 EUR) without the details. Not enough information is provided in connection to dissemination presentation: only the lump sum and one offer without details about the number of presentation, etc.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003832</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	SERIOUS ORGANISED CRIME AGENCY
<b>Project title:</b>	The Fight Against Cocaine Trafficking by Containers through the Rip Off Modus Operandi.
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	UK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	13
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	French general Directorate of Customs and Excise (FR); Dutch Customs National Office (NL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The Organised Crime Threat Assessment (OCTA) 2011, Europol emphasised the growing trend of cocaine smuggling by containers, which are increasingly used by OCG's to ship cocaine from Latin America to the EU. On this basis the COSI decided in the framework of the EU policy cycle to set up a priority dedicated to the fight against smuggling in shipping containers (see council Conclusions on setting EU priorities for the fight against organised crime between 20011 - 2012). Amongst the actions for this priority, included in the Operational Action Plan (OAP, doc 17825/2/11 REV2 RESTREINT UE), the participants decided to dedicate a specific action to the rip off method. This OAP is driven by the French and Dutch customs, this specific action is being lead by the UK. (SOCA/UKBF).</p> <p>The rip off method involves using a legal shipment of goods between two companies, or an empty container, in order to smuggle illicit drugs (mainly cocaine). This method requires the involvement of OCG's in the ports of departure/transit and arrival to load and recover the drugs.</p> <p>This action will be conducted by a team of 6 law enforcement experts from the MS participating in this action (Belgium, France, Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain &amp; UK), with specific knowledge of maritime trafficking by container. This group will visit key EU ports identified as being impacted by the rip off method to carry out a survey and meet the different law enforcement agencies involved (police and customs etc). This will enable the team to produce an evaluation report dedicated to the rip off threat to the EU from these key ports. Based on intelligence the following countries should be visited:</p> <p>Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Portugal and Italy as key ports in these countries are assessed to be most affected within the EU by the trafficking of cocaine by the Rip Off method. A meeting with the UNODC and Europol will also be scheduled. During the working visits the team will meet the various law enforcement services involved in the fight against drug trafficking by rip off to assess the threat and gather all the intelligence and information needed to gain an overall picture of this modus operandi in the EU. This part of the project should be carried out by July 2013 and a closing meeting will be held in London in July. An assessment of the scale of the rip off threat from containers in the EU will be produced and published. This assessment will identify the scale of the threat, key rip off ports in the EU, the number of rip off teams involved, their interaction with other OCG's and the impact they have on the cocaine flow to the EU.</p> <p>The second part of the project is aimed at identifying and assessing the level of rip on in the key ports of departure. An analysis of the EU seizure data will be conducted after which participants will set up a meeting with UNODC to discuss the findings in conjunction with the Container Control Programme initiated in 2003 jointly with WCO. A team of four experts from various MS will then visit the key 'rip on' countries in Latin America. An initial analysis of intelligence by MS experts leading this OAP action have</p>	

<p>identified Colombia, Ecuador, Panama and Dominican Republic as the countries who pose the biggest threat to the EU from the Rip on method. The liaison officer networks of the MS countries will be utilised to assess the local situation and facilitate meetings with the relevant law enforcement administrations by the MS experts. This part of the project will be conducted over 5 months from July 2013. The purpose of these working visits is to assess the level of rip on taking place in the ports of origin in comparison to the amount of drugs moving through the ports and the interaction between rip on teams working in Latin America and rip off teams within the key EU ports. An assessment of the scale and impact on the cocaine flow to the EU from the rip on teams and their interaction with the supply OCG's will be produced by December 2013.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	121.926
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	109.773,40
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 83

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 109.675,64

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

This trilateral project proposal aims to enhance the fight against cocaine trafficking involving the so-called "rip-off" method and is therefore in full conformity with the call for proposals, since it seeks to improve cooperation and information exchange between LEA. It focusses on an issue which has been identified as a growing trend by EUROPOL in its OCTA assessment and has been decided upon by COSI as a priority action. It will not only investigate the situation in European ports of arrival but also in countries of origin in conjunction with the Container Control Programme initiated in 2003 jointly with the WCO. The target groups are law enforcement officers from five EU MS.

The impact of such a project could be considerable in order to determine how much cocaine is smuggled into the EU via containers and in developing methods to prevent this cocaine trade by improving port security/intelligence. This will help to gain a more complete picture of a growing threat to the EU and enable law-enforcement to take tailored counter-measures. The applicant has duly defined the indicators for measurement of the projects output. The involvement of law enforcement agencies from several EU MS and Europol makes it possible that the stream of benefits will continue after the period of external support has ended. The proposed dissemination actions are appropriate. The results of the project will create a basis for joint operation (as described by the applicant) using available European resources to fight drug smuggling through the rip off method and to dismantle rip off teams operating within European ports. The impact of the project should be evaluated by successful law enforcement operations and effective prevention of this form of criminality.

The proposal contains clear and well planned explanation on the objectives to be reached. The most important results of the project will be the experience of the law enforcement community on this particular modus operandi of the organised criminality and two reports will be drafted within the project, one on global assessment of the threat in the EU, the other on the scale of the rip on threat from containers bound for the EU from Latin America. The deliverables and outputs are appropriately defined by the applicant. The applicant demonstrates the knowledge on the past and current developments in this field of action and the previous results and experience will be used within the project. The applicant has identified possible risks and risk mitigation action.

The proposed methodology and the selected actions are appropriate to reach the defined results. The

applicant has precisely divided the tasks between the partners within the project. Still the establishment of a permanent Steering group for evaluation of the progress of the project would be advisable. The applicant has defined indicators for measurement of the projects output (delivery of two reports and quality of assessment). The defined indicators are relevant for a project of a purely operational intelligence gathering character. The choice of partners is appropriate. The project team is professional as regards the law enforcement specific field so in implementation of EU funded projects. The proposed time frame is well planned and targeted to the result. The proposed actions are well prepared, planned and reflected appropriately in the budget.

The project involves LEA experts from six MS (BE, FR, NL, SI, ES, UK) in order to visit key ports in the EU identified as being particularly affected. The number of the involved MS is sufficient to reach the expected result and to use the reached results for further law enforcement work. Due to its topic the action concerns the majority of the EU MS, not only those that have large sea ports. The project does have transnational nature that even goes beyond the borders of the EU.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The proposal is comprehensive focussing on the situation in the ports of arrival as well as the ports of departure. It is clear and concise and should lead to attaining the intended results.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The risk for the success of the project lays in the quality of the received information and the quality of cooperation of the involved parties. The budget form could be elaborated more precisely in accordance with the Guide for Applicants.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs in the budget duly reflect the planned activities. The amount of the grant sought is proportionate for the importance and the expected impact of this action. The budget proposal includes precise but brief information that could be elaborated in more detail. E.g. as regards the planned expenses for the meetings, i.e. travelling and DSA expenses, there is no precise indication in the budget form for how many persons are these expenses calculated. There are no staff costs foreseen in the budget. The involvement of project staff (names and number of days even if at 0 costs) should in any case be reflected in the budget form, as well as the names of people that will be travelling.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003834</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	FEDERAL MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR/ CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE SERVICE
<b>Project title:</b>	Joint Investigations along the Balkan Route to combat drug trafficking into the EU (incl. precursor-smuggling and confiscation of criminal assets)
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	AT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	16
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Bundeskriminalamt - Wiesbaden/Deutschland (DE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Ministry of the Interior of Republic of CROATIA - General Police Directorate (HR)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational

**Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):**

Das AT Bundeskriminalamt plant in Kooperation mit den Partnerländern DE + HR (vorerst als Associated Partner; Vollpartner nach dem EU-Beitritt im Juli 2013) ein 16 monatiges Projekt (April 2013 – Juli 2014), das auf gemeinsame Ermittlungen entlang der Balkan Route-BR (HU,CZ,RO,BG,TR,HR,RS, ME, AL,KS,FYROM) zur Bekämpfung des Drogenschmuggels in die EU unter spezieller Berücksichtigung des Schmuggels von Drogenausgangsstoffen und der Abschöpfung des aus diesem Schmuggel resultierenden Vermögens abzielt.

Allgemeine Ziele: Verbesserung der Strafverfolgungszusammenarbeit mit den BR-Staaten (Fokus: Beitritts-, Kandidatenstaaten); Vorbereitung des Einsatzes von gemeinsamen Ermittlungsteams (JIT)  
Operative Ziele: Durchführung von Meetings zur Planung von gemeinsamen Ermittlungs- und Fahndungsschritten, die dann mittels JITs umgesetzt werden können. Dabei sollen die Kriminalitätsformen der Drogenkriminalität entlang der BR bekämpft, Tätergruppierungen zerschlagen und Drogen sichergestellt werden.

Methodik: Fokus des Projekts liegt auf der Erarbeitung und Durchführung von gemeinsamen Vorgehensweisen + Aktionen. Voraussetzung dafür ist, dass Informationen im administrativen, rechtlichen und operativen Bereich laufend und mit hoher Qualität ausgetauscht sowie evaluiert werden. Die Projektumsetzung erfolgt in 2 Mechanismen: 1. Konferenzen, 2. operative Meetings

1) 2 Konferenzen (Ort: AT, HR-nach EU Beitritt): An der jeweiligen Konferenz nehmen Ermittler und Experten aus 27 EU MS, Beitritts- und Kandidatenländern, Westbalkan Ländern (WB), CH, UA, US, RF, Europol, Eurojust, Interpol, EMCCDA, UNODC, EK teil. Ziel ist ein rechtlicher und operativer Informationsaustausch betreffend die Bekämpfung des Drogenhandels (inkl. Precursorschmuggel und Vermögensabschöpfung) entlang der BR sowie die Erarbeitung von richtungweisenden Grundsatzentscheidungen. Der jeweiligen aktuellen Situation angepasst werden Spezialthemen (z.B. Vermögensabschöpfung) in Workshops ausgearbeitet und diskutiert. Die Resultate dienen als Basis für weitere gemeinsame Ermittlungen der Partnerländer in Kooperation mit den Balkanländern. Durch die Einbeziehung der Balkanländer (RS, ME, AL, KS, FYROM) wird die existierende Problematik an der Wurzel erfasst, zumal über diese Länder der überwiegende Teil des in Afghanistan erzeugten Heroins und Opiatprodukte geschmuggelt wird.

2) Ca. 10 operative Meetings dienen der Planung und Akkordierung gemeinsamer Ermittlungen. Diese finden je nach Bedarf (Ermittlungsstand) statt und dienen der Koordination der betroffenen Länder (EU MS+WB), um entlang der BR operierende Tätergruppen zu zerschlagen. Die Teilnahme erfolgt durch ca. 13 Ermittler (Teilnehmer je nach Bedarf von EU-MS + WB, Europol und Eurojust). Ziel ist die

Organisationseinheiten der verschiedenen Länder zu einer gemeinsamen Strategie zur Bekämpfung des Drogenschmuggels entlang der BR zu bewegen. Dabei werden rechtliche Aspekte und Erkenntnisse über die Verdächtigen bis hin zur Örtlichkeit und Zeitpunkt des Einschreitens akkordiert. In weiterer Folge sollen JITs zur Zerschlagung krimineller Gruppierungen und die Sicherstellung illegaler Drogen gebildet werden. Output soll eine Verbesserung der Kommunikation zwischen den verschiedenen Ländern und Organisationen sein. Die gemeinsamen Informationen dienen operativen Aktivitäten zur Verhaftung von Tätern.

Zielgruppe: Drogenermittler aus EU MS, WB (Beitritts-, Kandidaten- und Drittländer) sowie Europol, Interpol, EMCDDA, EK, UNODC

Ergebnisse:

- Weitere Entwicklung gemeinsamer EU-Standards + Best Practice unter Bedachtnahme auf die EU-Drogenstrategie 05-12 und Drogenaktions Plan 09-12
- Verbessertes Daten- und Informationsaustausch zwischen EU MS, Kandidaten-, Drittstaaten, Europol, Interpol, Eurojust
- Resultate aus den operativen Aktivitäten: Aufdeckung krimineller Netzwerke, Zerschlagung von Tätergruppierungen, Sicherstellung von Drogen- und Drogenausgangsstoffen, Einziehung von Erträgen aus Straftaten
- JITs
- Projektbroschüre.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	449.415,5
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	426.944,7
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	95

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 78

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 297.792,50

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objectives of the project are properly defined and are in line with the general objectives of the ISEC programme. The project addresses the priority of operational law enforcement cooperation. It aims to tackle the drug trafficking into EU (including precursor smuggling and assets confiscation) with conferences and common meetings, geared at building networks, exchanging information and if possible setting up joint investigation teams. It addresses a real/actual need as the drug and precursor trafficking along the Balkan Route is a matter of concern and needs special attention. The need for closer cooperation and action is highlighted in several strategy documents, like the Stockholm Programme, the EU strategy and action plan on fighting drug trafficking which has a high priority. The target groups and beneficiaries are law enforcement and again, relevant for the ISEC Programme. In particular, it is necessary to involve also non-EU-States along the Balkan Route and relevant international organisations and EU agencies.

The project can have a positive impact as it enables law enforcement from the EU (member states and Europol) as well as neighbouring countries and international organisations (Interpol, UNODC etc) to meet and exchange practices on illegal drug trafficking from the Balkans and in operational meetings to plan and coordinate joint investigations. The impact in the short and medium term will be the dismantling of criminal networks acting along the Balkan Route, the establishment of closer cooperation and best practice measures and the improvement of the information exchange. In the long term drug and precursor trafficking will be effectively fought and security in whole Europe increased. There are indicators mentioned that will allow the measurement of the project output. They are relevant and verifiable. The proposed dissemination strategy is adequate. The sustainability of the project is not clear as it limits itself to mention



that contacts are established and the brochure of the project will be distributed. No mentioning is made of sustaining the investigations that will start within the project. The impact of this project could be measured by the monitoring of the number of operations, arrested criminals, seized drugs and precursors and confiscations of criminal proceeds.

The proposal explains well how the objective/s should be reached and the results achieved. The expected results strive to achieve improving operational cooperation and coordination and the most important results are networking, exchange of intelligence and joint investigations of drug trafficking from the Balkans. The deliverables are well described but could be more concrete in terms of number and description of the joint investigations and types of drugs targeted (i.e. heroin, cocaine, synthetic drugs). The proposal fits with the priorities of reinforcing operational police cooperation, the EU drugs strategy/action plan but the description of the actions could have benefited from more focus. This brings to the main risk of the proposal - it is so broad that it risks ending up as a travel/meeting project, with little operational output. This risk is not identified by the applicant - who identifies as a risk the diversity in approaches and lack of involvement of states. The corresponding risk mitigation strategies are also weak, just focusing on procedural options (e.g. hiring translators) but not addressing the differences in perceptions and priorities (which would require different risk mitigation strategies such as involving the chiefs of police etc).

The methodology does start from a problem description (80% to 90% of drug trafficking comes through the Balkans). However, it does not list source data and details it per type of drugs (e.g. cocaine uses different routes into the EU). It also does not detail what the problem is currently in terms of operational law enforcement cooperation in combatting drug trafficking from the Balkans, therefore it is not clear whether the chosen methodology of meetings is appropriate and will lead to an increased operational cooperation and joint investigation teams. In addition, the added value of the 2nd conference is not clear. As in the past similar projects were implemented it is even more important to understand why this approach is chosen and valid. The planning and monitoring strategy is sufficient. Furthermore, the indicators mentioned in the application are relevant and verifiable as they do include number of investigations, apprehended criminals, confiscated drugs and money. The choice of partners is adequate, however the involvement of Europol could have improved the transnational dimension of the proposal. The involvement of non-EU-States along the Balkan route and international organisations and EU agencies is important and justified. The time frame for the planned 2 conferences and 10 operational meetings is on the short side.

The project is transnational and its project structure spans across AT, DE and HR. The proposed actions will include and impact on the majority of the EU Member States and their travel/meeting costs are budgeted, making this feasible. Drug trafficking from the Balkans concerns the majority of the EU Member States and as such the implementation of the action concerns them. However, the number of EU Member States involved is large and they are maybe too many in terms of reaching the objectives of enhanced operational cooperation and joint investigations.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The main strengths of the proposal are its relevance in terms of EU strategies and relevance for the target groups of ISEC (law enforcement), giving them an opportunity to work together more closely by funding common operational meetings. The target group is very relevant. The partners are technically competent and the outputs can be promising if achieved. Furthermore, the indicators mentioned in the application are relevant and verifiable as they do include number of investigations, apprehended criminals, confiscated drugs and money.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The methodology does not detail what the problem is currently in terms of operational law enforcement cooperation in combatting drug trafficking from the Balkans, therefore it is not clear whether the chosen methodology of meetings is appropriate and will lead to an increased operational cooperation and joint

investigation teams. In addition, the added value of the 2nd conference is not clear.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs in the budget are reflecting the activities listed in the Technical Annex in the Application Form and include travel and meeting costs of participants. However, the amount of the grant sought is not deemed proportionate to the importance and the expected impact of the promised output as the actions do not describe a specific output in terms of joint investigations or intelligence exchanged and no clear analysis is made of current obstacles in law enforcement cooperation in the area. Value for money is improved by cutting the costs of the 2nd conference (unclear added value) and 2 operational meetings (as too many to manage in the timeframe). For some costs, like for translation/interpretation, rent for meeting rooms and equipment, printing the brochure, no calculation is provided, like offers etc.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003835</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF JUSTICE - JUVENILE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
<b>Project title:</b>	Yo.Vi - Integrated Restorative Justice Models For Victims and Youth
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	IT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Psychoanalytic Institute for Social Research (IT); Pro Prietenia Arad (RO); CJD-Eutin (DE); Kuriteoennetuse Sihtasutus (KESA) / Crime Prevention Foundation (CPF) (EE); Caritas Estonia - Victim Support Service (EE); Portuguese Association for Victim Support (APAV) (PT); Center for Legal Studies & Specialized Training (ES); Probation Service, Ireland (IE); University of Studies of Palermo - DEMS (Department of European Studies and International Integration) (IT); Don Calabria Institute (IT); Directorate for Penal Execution in the Community and Juvenile Justice (ES)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Ministry for Justice, Culture and Europe (DE)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>There is a growing recognition in the EU of the importance of providing victims with a greater role in penal proceedings while ensuring their protection and meeting their needs. While there are multiple potential means of responding to these needs, restorative justice (RJ) represents an apparently tailor made tool for involving victims, providing them with a voice while ensuring their protection and dignity. Practice however demonstrates that RJ, as put into practice, does not necessarily live up to its full potential. Yo.Vi – Integrated Restorative Justice Models for Victims and Youth explores the potential of RJ practices within juvenile justice systems to provide an enhanced role to victims while maintaining a strong focus on the juvenile offender and ensuring the ethical treatment of both.</p> <p>Yo.Vi, promoted by the Italian Ministry of Justice – Department of Juvenile Justice, involves a multi-institution, multi-disciplinary partnership with 12 organizations and 1 associate partner from 7 EU Member States (Italy, Ireland, Estonia, Germany, Portugal, Romania, and Spain) bringing together ministries of justice, victim support organizations, NGOs, research institutes, and universities. Target groups—juvenile justice institutions and practitioners, restorative justice practitioners, victim support organizations—are involved both as partners and participants.</p> <p>The project aims to promote the integration of victims and victim protection within existing restorative justice practices in the juvenile justice system in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) identify and take advantage of existing good practices both within RJ and victim-specific services in order to improve the capacity to involve, support, and protect victims;</li> <li>2) promote and enhance the involvement of victim support organisations in selected areas and cooperation between JJ, RJ and victim support organizations;</li> </ol>	

3) enhance interventions targeting victims within existing restorative justice models, developing an innovative and common line of intervention in order to improve good practices related to the provision of support and counselling to victims of crime, enhancing their role within RJ practices accordance with victim protection principles; and 4) create multi-level stakeholder networks.

Activities are divided into four macro-categories:

1) national research: identification and assessment of RJ and victim support services and practices by means of desk research and interviews;

2) national workshop series involving local and national stakeholders focusing on the development of national integration strategies;

3) transnational workshop series in Estonia, Romania and Spain focusing a comparative discussion of national strategies and the development of EU strategy guidelines; and 4) international activities comprised of an international state of the art report and international stakeholder network.

The dissemination strategy relies heavily upon the project activities (e.g., network building, direct stakeholder involvement) as well as electronic dissemination through project and partner websites supported by periodic newsletters, mailing lists and a project brochure.

Deliverables include: national research and integration strategy reports, EU Integration Strategy Guidelines, international state of the art report, international stakeholder network, and mid-term and final administrative reports. Yo.Vi will conclude with a final conference in Rome involving key national and EU stakeholders from all sectors.

Yo.Vi is expected to have a direct and immediate impact on RJ practices within partner countries, enhancing inter-agency cooperation and the role, protection and support provided to victims. Greater awareness and the development of provisions (e.g., legislation, programmes, services) for integrated RJ models that focus on victims and offenders in a balanced manner within partner countries and other EU Member States is expected in the long term.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	378.057,93
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	340.251,93
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 78.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 339.502,27

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The proposal demonstrates good conformity with objective 4 of the ISEC Programme (promoting and developing best practices for the protection of crime victims) and directly addresses priority 14 of the Targeted Call, concerned with promoting the integration of victims (in the context of restorative justice practices with juveniles). Additionally, and as indicated by the applicant, the requirement for such a project has a long history in European policy contexts – the protection and compensation of crime victims and the implementation of minimum standards in this regard has long-since been established as an EU priority – in recent EU directives and framework decisions. Relevant target audiences (impressive in number, moreover) from different relevant settings have been identified (juveniles themselves are not directly involved, though).

Good prospects of effectively delivering added value on the level of relevant partners of the 7 MS involved (and ultimately beyond, through the dissemination of results which are likely to be intrinsically relevant for other MS as well). The proposed stakeholder network for operational cooperation and exchange will be an important dissemination mechanism for the project outcomes, while achieving the additional objectives of mutual cooperation on the basis of common understanding and harmonised practices. The direct

involvement of target group stakeholders and practitioners, and the parallel establishment of a transnational network for operational cooperation/exchange demonstrate the likelihood of a continuous stream of benefits beyond the lifetime of the project. In terms of sustainability, the best practices and models for interagency cooperation are designed to fit within extant local and national infrastructure without imposing a requirement for the investment of significant additional resources on the stakeholder practitioners and as such, could be used beyond the lifetime of the project on a local/national level. It is less clear how the mutual cooperation/exchange that would be fostered through the proposed EU/international platform would be sustained beyond the financing period. Project indicators are well defined and supported by comprehensive internal and external project evaluation strategies.

The proposal is clear in pointing out how the objectives will be reached, and on what the outcomes will be. It is well-conceived in that it could, in its lifetime, make a significant contribution to the development and implementation of evidence-based, integrated approaches to victim-centric restorative justice practices in the context of juvenile crime at European level. The specific objectives demonstrate excellent fit with the available evidence and extant policy requirements (in addition, an extensive supporting bibliography is supplied). Project risks and attendant mitigation strategies, particularly those in the Technical Annex, are well-identified and described. The TORs of the project are wide-ranging and ambitious and as such there is an inherent risk of "mission creep." However this risk is somewhat diminished by a robust project implementation framework and an equally comprehensive monitoring and evaluation approach wherein parallel, external monitoring responsibilities have been allocated to the University of Palermo.

Given the ambitious TORs of this work, the methodology is both comprehensive and credible as is the composition of the consortium in terms of partner representatives' respective skills and experiences - however additional methodological detail in relation to the research activity would be helpful, both as an additional indicator of project quality and justification of costs. The monitoring and evaluation strategy is credible and extensive, being firmly rooted in an explicit PM framework and given explicit focus in the project activities. Evaluation indicators also extend to the measurement of impact of project activities and outputs on the target groups and beneficiaries. Precise task and responsibility distribution, including identification of profiles.

The very profile of the participant group, which comprises representatives from seven MS, demonstrates the pan-European relevance of this project and potential value and impact of its envisaged outputs. The best practices and transnational network structure proposed for development under the auspices of the consortium activities have the potential to be transposed into other, or all European countries given that the consortium have made provisions to produce and promote EU Integration Strategy Guidelines within the framework of the project.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Conceptually and methodologically sound and well-prepared actions. Adequate budgeting. Good impact and transferability potential. Well elaborated monitoring and evaluation strategy. Experienced network of partners, many of whom maintain direct responsibility for the implementation of new practices at local/national level. Elaboration of EU guidelines on restorative justice and victim protection in the context of juvenile crime is a distinct benefit of this project

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

No direct involvement of juveniles. Sustainability strategy for the transnational network is unclear. Additional detail on the research methodology to assess feasibility/justify resource requirement is required.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget is comprehensive, duly justified with salary slips, proforma quotes, etc. and adequately accommodates the proposed project activities. Staff costs are reasonable; non-standard, unexplained

Annex - Individual conclusion sheets for all proposals received summing up the results of evaluation

abbreviations used to denote units under Heading A. For some staff, employment status (civil servant, specifically employed) is to be clarified. Subcontracting costs associated with the researcher Antony Pemberton are not identified / justified in the relevant section of the application form; justification is to be provided.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003836</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR OF THE SR
<b>Project title:</b>	Enhancement of exchange of forensic information among law enforcement agencies
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	SK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Institute of Criminalistics Prague (CZ); Central Forensic Laboratory of the Police (PL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Objective: To promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, other national authorities and related Union bodies</p> <p>Activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TRIADA workshops (12 workshops SK/CZ/PL, 3 days/2 nights each, 8 forensic experts for a meeting) - Training of and other exchanges among law enforcement officers (18 months)</li> <li>2. Electronic magazine EXPERT - creation of focused on forensic science, operational police practices, methods, crime scene experience, police work, any relevant information in connection with LEOs case work, exchange of information for law enforcement purposes (12 months)</li> </ol> <p>Supporting activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. procurement and purchase of HW and SW necessary for electronic magazine (4 months)</li> <li>4. development of LEA platform for information exchange (12 months)</li> </ol> <p>Duration: 24 months</p> <p>Methodology: The structures regulating the implementation of the project are given by the standards regulating the FSI and by project management principles. These principles will be obligatory for all involved members of the project team during the whole period of project implementation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In case of subcontracting, procurement will be realized according to the legislation of Slovak Republic, contract with supplier will be signed by representative of Mol.</li> <li>2. To implement the submitted project, a project team has been established consisting of project manager, financial manager and team members. This team will secure everyday implementation of the project, communication with target groups by standard channels of Mol. Superiority and subordination relations result from the actual organization structure of the Mol and FSI PC, system of valid documentation and process structure.</li> </ol> <p>Partnership: CZ, PL</p> <p>Target groups: Law enforcement officials and forensic experts</p> <p>Expected results: 12 workshops for 96 participants: 64 forensic experts, 32 LEOs (32/SK, 32/CZ, 32/PL) LEA platform for information exchange,, available to all law enforcement officers and forensic experts electronically, and electronic magazine EXPERT</p> <p>Deliverables: Reports from the workshops</p>	

Guideline for EXPERT/LEA usage (How to use it) Dissemination strategy - information about the project and its activities during 11th International Forensic Symposium in Bratislava in September 2013 will be disseminated among participants - on web page of IFS information with contacts and invitation for other experts to join discussion forum during project will be published - the report will be published on IFS web site - Guideline will be distributed to the partners and their cooperating agencies if necessary	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	185.527,24
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	176.227,24
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	94,99

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 80

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 145.544,86

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objective of the project is clearly explained by applicant, highlighting the constraints for forensic institutes to access LEA forensic information and the lack of a proper communication platform. The project aims to promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies and other national authorities. It is also in line with ISEC Call to promote exchange of information for law enforcement purposes and training. Target group is competent forensic institutes in the 3 partner countries.

Improving cross-border cooperation among LEAs and forensic experts in CEE by creating an LEA platform is likely to generate a positive impact on crime fighting in the region as well as in the wider EU. A cooperation project and platform as well as an online magazine can furthermore contribute to improving information-exchange and working relationships and may thus also benefit crime-fighting in the region. The evaluation is based on ISO standards and includes different groups of general indicators such as number of participants or publications on the digital publication. This task will be carried out by the project team. Dissemination strategy is strongly based on IFS environment which will allow to expand the results of the project to EU forensic community. After ISEC support is finished maintenance of electronic magazine will be afforded by SK Mol. The project should be evaluated based on the quality of the electronic magazine, real use of the platform and number of participants and their impressions from the project. It would also be advisable to check whether dissemination through IFS channels is impacting positively in other MS.

The applicant clearly explains the objectives, exact numbers of participants, activities to be carried out and products to be expected, but the agenda for meetings among partners is not described. Expected results are linked to general ISEC priorities to promote mutual understanding among LEAs and other competent authorities but there is no specific Call for forensic matters, being the collection of evidences a general target for all areas of concern. Most important result is the platform to be developed and the digital publication. This initiative is not relying on previous projects or events but is trying to cover a lack of channels for cooperation among forensic experts other than IFS. The main risk of this project is the real added value of the digital magazine and the platform, in terms of number of users and potential beneficiaries, by contrary the project is likely to achieve a closer cooperation among partners. Risks identified by applicant are the general risks expected when organising international meetings and



developing IT products. Risk mitigation is coherent to the risks listed by the applicant and it is strongly based on partners' forensic experience.

Methodology is based on standard management procedures by means of a project team to decide tasks and staff to be attached. This project team will be also in charge of the monitoring of the project. All trainings and workshops aim to produce a platform and publication which will be used as tool for information exchange. In order to set basis for the platform and magazine it seems to be adequate to gather experts on workshops to identify common needs. This option seems to be reasonable in order to produce a useful tool. Partners show enough experience either on forensic field but also on international project management. Timeframe seem to be realistic due to the number of workshops to be convoked and also to have enough time to launch procurements for the HW/SW needed for the platform and magazine.

This project has a real transnational nature as it is involving 3 partners in a key region on EU. It would allow to improve trans-border cooperation among partners and it could be used as an efficient example of improvement on forensic information exchange among experts at EU level. In this sense, this could be easily offered to other MSs or to other regions within EU. This transnational nature is to be considered not only for the number of countries involved concept but also in terms of impact on forensic environment.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Clear methodology, good planning and preparation of the proposal, real transnational nature, conformity with ISEC general priorities.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Potential overlaps with the other applications submitted by the applicant require scrutiny especially when it comes to financing.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs of the project seem to be realistic. Overall the proposal seems to represent good value for money. The only worrying fact is that all staff seems to be involved in all tasks, this should be clarified in order to avoid overlappings and resources wasting. Number of days and daily rate for financial management have been reduced (ISCO2) to improve efficiency. Travel costs are relatively low given the fact that there shall be twelve workshops, but most travel will be done by rail owing to the relative proximity of project partner countries. The number of meetings 12 in 24 months has not been motivated but may be necessary to generate mutual trust and build a working relationship as well as the platform foreseen in the project. Costs seem moderate and justified to conduct the project. Equipment prizes to host the platform and possibly also the online journal seem realistic, various offers have been sought on the market (not clear if VAT is included in the price – clarification to be provided). There may also be some potential for synergies if subcontracting for the three application 3836, 3837 and 3838 was bundled, since similar tasks need to be performed i.e. procurement of hardware and software.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003837</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR OF THE SR
<b>Project title:</b>	Improvement of DNA forensic laboratory cooperation and information exchange in V4 countries
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	SK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Institute of Criminalistics Praha (CZ) Hungarian Institute for Forensic Science (HU) Central Forensic Laboratory of the Police (PL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Objectives To promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies" specifically among CZ, HU, SK and PL forensic laboratories.</p> <p>Main activity 1 Promotion and development of Best practice manual/guideline (further "BPM/G") on Identification of the unknown human remains and persons by DNA analyses of all available autosomal STRs, Y-STRs loci and mt-DNA sequencing, which will reflect the communication of ENFS DNAWG (15 months) 2 Follow-up examination of evidence and verification of method (11 months) 3 Workshop on DNA identification (5 days/4 nights, Slovakia, 2PL, 2CZ, 2HU, 2SK) 4 Partnership meetings in CZ, HU, SK, PL with onsite visits of laboratories (4 x 3 days/2 nights, 4 x 8 experts + 4 x 1 head of DNA unit = 3PL, 3CZ, 3HU, 3SK)</p> <p>Supporting activities 5 Preparation of report on ENFSI members practice + conclusions - SK organize CODIS, EDNAP and ENFSI meeting in spring 2013, we want to gather the information about the way laboratories deal with the identification and use the results during workshop and meetings; anonymous questionnaire with up to 10 topics with the information about project will be given to participants (up to 100 members from 53 ENFSI laboratories) this is preliminary phase and will be done before project, results will be gathered in short report for further use at the very beginning of other activities (1 month) and updated after BPM/guideline and follow-up examination will be done (2 months) 6 procurement, purchase and validation of genetic analyser and RT PCR system (8 months)</p> <p>Duration - 24 months</p> <p>Methodology - The structures regulating the implementation of the project are given by the standards regulating the IFS PF and by project management principles. These principles will be obligatory for all involved members of the project team during the whole period of project implementation.</p> <p>1. Procurement will be realized according to the legislation of Slovak Republic, contract with supplier will be signed by representative of Mol. 2. For realisation of project a project team has been established consisting of project manager, financial manager and project members. This team will secure everyday's implementation of the project, communication with target groups by standard channels of Mol. Superiority and subordination relations result from the actual organisation structure of the Mol and FSI PF, system of valid documentation and process structure.</p>	

<p>3. Manual will be developed in line with ISO/IEC 17025:2005.                  4. Partnership meeting's reports will be part of the documentation and final project report.                  5. Publicity                  Partnership - CZ, HU, PL                  Target group - forensic experts, law enforcement officials                  Expected results - short report on today's practice of ENFSI laboratories, exchange of information and practice dealing with identification of victims and bodies with unknown identity, enhancement of cooperation among V4 DNA laboratories, workshop and exchanges among law enforcement officers                  Deliverables - report, BPM/G                  Dissemination strategy                  - information about the project and its activities during CODIS, EDNAP and ENFSI DNAWG meeting in Bratislava in April 2013 will be disseminated among participants                  - on web page of IFS information with contacts and invitation for other experts to join discussion about BPM/G during project will be published                  - the report will be published on IFS PF web site and distributed to the ENFSI DNA WG board                  - BPM/G will be distributed to the partners and their cooperating agencies if necessary</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	312.973,15
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	297.173,15
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	94,95

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 83.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 261.561,76

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The project is geared towards promoting and developing cross-border cooperation among LEAs in the field of forensic DNA-investigation. It is clearly in line with the objectives of the call for proposals. Given the fact that crime has become a cross-border phenomenon in many regions of the EU, there seems to be a clear need to improve and speed-up forensic cooperation according to standardised guidelines in order to simplify the identification of human tissue samples/body parts also in the wider context of Prüm cooperation. Addressing cooperation between LEA officials and forensic experts in the Visegrad 4 countries in CEE should be regarded as being highly relevant in the context of the ISEC-Programme. The proposed target groups include law enforcement and forensic experts from four EU MS, in addition there will be 19 EU MS participating in the project and 3 candidate countries and 6 other countries. The proposed target groups are relevant to the objectives of the ISEC programme.

The likely impact as defined by the applicant in medium term will be achieved by better cooperation among V4 countries in area of DNA identification that will impact on V4 LEAs and citizens of the EU MS. In long term the impact is supposed to be as increase of individual identification in case of DNA profile exchange through Prüm data exchange that will directly impact EU Prüm operational EU MS. The indicators for achievement are concrete and verifiable as the applicant will use the standard procedures of Mol and IFS, ISO 9001 quality management system, ISO/IEC 17025:2005. The best practice manual/guide on cooperation procedures within and among partner-laboratories would be disseminated among interested parties and would therefore remain a tangible result/product of the project adding to standardisation of procedures which could possibly also be transferred to other regional contexts in the EU. The involvement of ENFSI DNAWG will facilitate the dissemination scope. The publication of the projects information in the web site of Mol could be provided also in English in order to widen the scope of dissemination actions.

Sustainability will also be ensured by applicant funding in the longer term. The proposed methodology of evaluation of the impact of the project by the applicant is appropriate and well defined.

The proposal contains sufficient explanations on how the proposed objective will be reached. The proposed actions for that include workshops, partnership meetings, drafting of Best Practice Manual, procurement of the relevant equipment and publicity actions. The most important results and outputs of the project are the raised experience of the involved experts, drafted Best Practice Manual, purchased forensic equipment and created cooperation network. The proposed deliverables and outputs are concrete enough. The applicant has defined the possible risks and the mitigation actions. The basic risk that is also mentioned by the applicant could be lack of DNA experts to participate in the project also due to the heavy everyday workload of these experts for the law enforcement purposes.

The selected methodology is appropriate and the selected actions are well targeted. The planned workshops constitute important part of the work in order to improve the DNA forensic laboratory cooperation and information exchange. It is not quite clear however is how activity 2 (analysis on purchased genetic analyser and RT PCR systems) will be successfully connected with the purchase/procurement of this material (activity 6) - in fact possible project implementation will depend on a successful procurement operation. This should therefore be the first activity to be conducted once the project is starting. The monitoring and evaluation actions are relevant. The proposed indicators for the measurement of projects output are relevant and appropriately defined. The applicant has involved not only four EU MS as partners of the project, but also several other EU MS, candidate countries and third countries for the implementation of the project. The involved partners are respective forensic institutions of the partner countries and the choice of partners is appropriate for the objectives to be reached. The applicant demonstrates sufficient professional and project implementation experience. The applicant has provided a detailed plan for the project implementation and timetable for the actions that will allow to reach the results within the planned 24 months.

The project has a strong European dimension with four European partners and aims to satisfy a genuine need for cross-border cooperation in the field of forensics. The elaboration of standard procedures in this field has the potential to benefit also other EU-MS and would therefore be transferable to other EU-regions. The existence of such procedures will help to facilitate and speed up cross-border cooperation in the EU and may thus positively impact on crime-fighting in the EU by improving investigation techniques.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Proposal is innovative and well presented and responds to European needs in the field of cross-border and Prüm cooperation. Professional capacity of the applicant and partners. Well developed implementation methodology.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Possible problems may arise with regard to the procurement part of the project which is essential for the other planned activities.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs in the budget do reflect the planned activities. Number of days and daily rate for financial management have been reduced (ISCO2) to improve efficiency. The offers for purchase of equipment are attached (not clear if VAT is included in the price – clarification to be provided). Costs for consumables re to be further detailed. There may also be some potential for synergies if subcontracting for the three application 3836, 3837 and 3838 was bundled, since similar tasks need to be performed i.e. procurement of hardware and software.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003838</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR OF THE SR
<b>Project title:</b>	Cross border forensic information exchange and support of cross border crime clarifying
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	SK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Voivodship Police Headquarters in Rzeszow (PL); Voivodship Police Headquarters in Krakow(PL); Voivodship Police Headquarters in Katowice (PL); Regional Police Directorate in Brno (CZ); Regional Police Directorate in Ostrava (CZ)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Objectives To promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies, exchanging forensic intelligence and expertise information specifically among CZ, SK and PL forensic laboratories.</p> <p>Main Activities 1 Development of LIMS platform for information exchange, acceptance procedure and evaluation of the system. Survey focused to the platform transfer functionality and types of transmitted information among partners will be part of the evaluation report (19 months) 2. Promotion and development of Best practice manual (further "BPM LIMS") for the procedure for information exchanging between forensic laboratories (12 months) 3 Partnership meetings in CZ, SK, PL with on site visits of laboratories - 6 meetings , 3 days/2 nights (SK meeting - 5SK + 4CZ + 6PL experts, 2xCZ meeting - 2 x 4 CZ, 6 PL, 2SK experts, 3xPL meeting - 3 x 4 CZ, 6 PL, 2SK experts) over the period of 21 months 4 Training of law enforcement officers - 6 workshops 1SK/2CZ3/PL for up to 10 experts (6 x 4 hours training = 24 hours) Supporting activity 5 Procurement and purchase of HW and SW (4 months) Duration - 24 months</p> <p>Methodology - The structures regulating the implementation of the project are given by the standards regulating the IFS PF and by project management principles. These principles will be obligatory for all involved members of the project team during the whole period of project implementation.</p> <p>1. Procurement will be realized according to the legislation of Slovak Republic, contract with supplier will be signed by representative of Mol. 2. For realisation of project a project team has been established consisting of project manager, financial manager and project members. This team will secure everyday's implementation of the project, communication with target groups by standard channels of Mol. Superiority and subordination relations result from the actual organisation structure of the Mol and FSI PF, system of valid documentation and process structure.</p>	

<p>3. Manual will be developed in line with ISO/IEC 17025 and 17020.                  4. Partnership meeting's minutes and list of participants will be part of the documentation and final project report.                  5. Publicity                  Partnership - CZ, PL                  Target group - forensic experts, law enforcement officials                  Expected results                  6 workshops ( 24 hours of training for up to 60 experts)                  6 meetings for 15 forensic experts (CZ, PL, SK).                  1 LIMS platform                  1 BPM LIMS                  Deliverables - final report, BPM LIMS                  Dissemination strategy                  - information about the project and its activities during annual ENFSI SOCWG (crime scene working group) meeting and during seminar "Criminalistics in the examples" will be disseminated among participants                  - BPM/L will be distributed to the partners and their cooperating agencies if necessary and will be published on partners web pages                  - publication of articles in IFS electronic magazine and/or CZ forensic magazine and professional forensic journals</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	205.834,25
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	195.334,25
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	94,90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 78

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 167.725,55

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objective of the project as defined by the applicant is to promote and develop coordination, cooperation and understanding among law enforcement agencies, exchanging forensic intelligence and expertise information specifically among CZ, SK and PL forensic laboratories. The objective is properly defined and clear. The proposed objective is in line with the general objective of the ISEC programme to contribute to a high level of security for citizens by preventing and combating crime, and with the priorities of the Call for Proposals. The proposed target groups contain experts of forensic laboratories, the beneficiaries are defined as police and law enforcement authorities in the project partner countries as well as other MS operational in line with Prum Decisions. The proposed target groups and beneficiaries are relevant to be addressed by ISEC programme.

Improving cooperation, exchange of forensic information and intelligence among three CEE-countries and training for relevant LEA-personnel is likely to generate a positive impact on crime fighting in the region as well as in the wider EU. Better cooperation and training should contribute significantly to solving crime cases and should therefore benefit crime-fighting in the region. The indicators for measurement of the project output are relevant and verifiable. Sustainability will be ensured by the applicant by resources of the MoI and by involvement of labs from other countries as well as by updating of BPM LIMS after five years. Though the dissemination actions are in general relevant and targeted at international forensic community still the involvement of the relevant EU Council and Commission working groups would be advisable.

The proposal explains appropriately how the proposed objectives should be reached. The proposal is related to development and transfer of technology and methodology and training exchange of staff and experts. The deliverables and outputs are adequately described. The applicant demonstrates sufficient knowledge on the past and current developments in this particular field of forensic cooperation. The applicant has described the basic risks for the implementation of the project. The applicant seems to be aware of potential risks especially those connected with the planned procurement activity (delays), the lack of forensic experts and their ability to participate in the project due to their heavy workload. The applicant has described sufficient risk mitigation actions and plans to manage the risks via general plan of preventive actions.

The proposed methodology is appropriate. The planned networking expert meetings are relevant and well targeted at reaching the defined results. The applicant plans to use standard project management methodologies, where inter alia the tasks for each member of the project will be decided in the planning and design of the project. The proposed monitoring and evaluation activities are appropriate. The choice of partners is adequate though involvement of more forensic institutions of other EU MS would be advisable in order to widen the scope of expertise and to reach the most effective results. The project team have sufficient professional and project management capacity and experience. The proposed actions are well planned in order to reach the results in the frame of 24 months. Activities 1 and 2 should probably follow activity three in order to gather input for the development of the platform and the elaboration of the manual.

Though the project structure is more related to the involved partner countries the expected results are planned to be disseminated to other EU MS. The impact of the project concerns mostly the involved partner countries. The involvement of other EU MS would enlarge the expertise and the added value of the project. The indirect impact of the project will be related to improvement of forensic information and data exchange among the EU MS thus improving the investigation quality and fight against crime.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Proposal is clear and well presented and responds to European needs in the field of cross-border cooperation. Professional capacity of the Applicant. Clear planning and well targeted actions.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

More EU MS could be involved in the project to widen the EU perspective of the objectives and in order to reach the most efficient results.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs of the project seem to be realistic and reflect the various activities which have been outlined in the application. All in all the project seems to represent good value for money. Equipment prizes for workstations and a server as well as the necessary licenses seem realistic, various offers have been sought on the market (not clear if VAT is included in the price – clarification to be provided). Depreciation of the material has been taken into account. Details and offer are to be provided on development of LIMS platform for information exchange. No DSAs should be foreseen if the meetings are held in the home town of the involved experts. Number of days and daily rate for financial management have been reduced (ISCO2) to improve efficiency. There may also be some potential for synergies if subcontracting for the three application 3836, 3837 and 3838 was bundled, since similar tasks need to be performed i.e. procurement of hardware and software.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003839</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	HOME AFFAIRS
<b>Project title:</b>	Administrative approach to organised crime : support European local authorities in combating local outcomes of organised crime
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	BE
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	City of Genk (BE); Regional Information and Expertise Center Limburg (NL); Catholic University Leuven, Faculty of Law, Leuven Institute of Criminology (BE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Local Police Genk-As-Opglabbeek-Zutendaal (BE); Province of Limburg (BE); Public Prosecutor Tongeren (BE); Association of Flemish Cities and Municipalities (BE); Ministry of Security and Justice, the Netherlands (NL); The Danish Crime Prevention Council (DK)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The central principle of the project is that local administrative authorities must play a major role, preliminary or complementary to the criminal law approach; thus, they can help to dismantle the link between legal and illegal society. This link exists where organised crime makes use of local infrastructure and facilities, e.g. in housing criminal activities (drug laboratories, human trafficking victims, ...) or in the laundering of criminal earnings (buying and selling of real estate, exploiting front companies, ...). The administrative approach also aims to prevent (unintentional) governmental facilitation of criminal activities, and to undermine acquired criminal positions of economic power.</p> <p>Local authorities have specific administrative instruments to tackle local strategies of organised crime, eg suspend, withdraw or refuse permits, close down premises, etc. Municipal employees are often the first party to perceive signals indicating organised crime: suspicious applications, commercial monopolies, real estate exchanges, ... To make local officials aware of suspicious patterns, training and education will be an important step in the administrative approach-process.</p> <p>In this approach, persons and properties are first investigated in municipal registers and databases. These findings are complemented with research in open sources: cadastre, Chamber of commerce, Lexis Nexis-website, (foreign) internet sites, Google etc. This leads to the construction of an information matrix. Based on this information, regular local information-exchange meetings are held to determine the approach of the information found. The outcome can either be an integrated approach, or a monodisciplinary approach (judicial, tax, administrative).</p> <p>Therefore, partnerships have to be established between local partners : municipal administrations as well as local police and social welfare. In a later stage, partnerships are set up with external partners: provincial authorities, public prosecution, tax authorities, Fiscal Inspection, Social Inspection etc.</p> <p>To make this integrated approach work, agencies need to share their information and cooperate in searching for the most effective way to deal with the threats that are discovered. By participating in this interagency cooperation, all agencies benefit: the unexploited administrative information aids judicial and fiscal investigations and enforces intelligence led policing procedures.</p> <p>Sharing the necessary information is, currently in Belgium, not evident. Therefore we aim to translate the</p>	



Dutch experience in this field, as it was built up in recent years, to the Belgian legislative context. The main partner in this process is the Dutch Regional Information and Expertise Center Limburg. Together with this Center the city of Genk will study how and to what extent the Dutch instruments can also be used in Belgium. To establish whether the applicable tools also maintain their use in a third member state context, a partnership with Denmark is set up. The outcome of this process is a procedures manual translating the experiences into a universal guide that can be used in other Member States (with a.o. best practices, list of necessary partners, FAQ's, literature, basic presentation and case-study). EUCPN, here, will provide support and council, while stimulating the implementation in other Member States.

To make the methodology internationally available, a 3-day conference will be held to which potentially interested parties from the EU Member States are invited. The manual will be made available on-line. Through EUCPN tools and expertise are disseminated to all 27 Member States.

For this project, 3 staff members will explicitly be employed for a period of 24 months : a coordinator, a technical/ICT-analyst, and an administrative assistant. Their actions will be supervised by a high-level committee, safeguarding the project's evolution and it's compliance with the overall city security management.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	492.324,27
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	432.324,27
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	87,81

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 76.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 310.594,97

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The project deals with the development and promotion of the administrative approach in the BE NL border region/town of Genk. This projects aims to test the methodology of the administrative approach at local level in Genk, a border town at the BE/NL border. The BE legal framework is not adapted to the implementation of the administrative approach and the project should be able to test to what extent the approach can be applied, what are the difficulties and legal obstacles. The development of the administrative approach to prevent and fight organised crime is one of the policy priorities in the internal security strategy. Crime prevention is one of the priorities under ISEC. Crime prevention in general and the administrative approach in particular is best applied at local level. The beneficiaries /participants in this project are predominantly local authorities and law enforcement bodies. The target groups are therefore relevant.

In the short term, the impact of this project will be that the awareness on the administrative approach will increase and serve to other MS (via a manual put at the disposal of all EU MS via the EUCPN website). In the long-term, once the concept is well established and the obstacles to implement the administrative approach in its entirety are taken away, it will have a positive impact on the local situation as regards the prevention and the fight against organised crime. To evaluate the success/effects of the project, scientific support is delivered through university partners. Otherwise the indicators are mainly quantitative (actions fulfilled). The dissemination strategy is very adequate as through the project itself 2 other member states will directly benefit from the methodology and in addition the manual will be put on line via the website of the European Crime Prevention Network. The project could be evaluated through interviews with the NL authorities who after this project should see an improvement of the level of cross border co-operation. The project could also trigger in BE legal amendments which would be needed to facilitate information

exchange between administrative entities.

The project describes rather briefly the steps that should lead to the expected results and meeting the set objectives. However, the supporting documents that have been sent with the project application (feasibility study) provide more details on the stakeholders to be involved, their roles and the results that will be achieved. The overall result to be achieved is the reduction in successful infiltrations by organised crime groups in the legal system as well as to complement the classical criminal law approaches when a criminal case is being investigated. The most important outputs are that at local level a methodology is developed and put in motion to increase operational co-operation between actors, to see which legal obstacles they meet and how they can and should be remedied and to enhance cross border co-operation with the NL. The risks identified seem fully relevant and are mitigated to the extent possible. The project team and background of the applicant is quite professional.

The methodology seems logical and straightforward. It is meant to be a bottom-up process that can lead to establishing an overall approach (the procedures applied, partners involved, suspicious patterns identified, operational strategies applied etc...), it will then be described in a manual which will be the main output of the project. A three days international conference will be held to evaluate and assess the experience gathered. The BE Mol has a lot of experience in managing EU financed projects. The administrative approach is by nature multi-disciplinary, so a wide range of partners was identified (details are in the annexed feasibility study) who will be associated depending on the specific cases on which the administrative approach will be applied. The time table is realistic as a lot of preparatory work has been done and the project is ready to take a "flying start". Scientific support by two universities (Leuven and Maastricht) is ensured to guarantee quality of the outputs. On the negative side, the information provided on the various points is sometimes very succinct.

The European added value is clear, although this project is very local (though closely associating two other EU MS): the administrative approach is by nature a methodology best tested and implemented at local level. The test case of Genk will provide indications to the central level on where the administrative approach faces difficulties (e.g. legal obstacles). The results of this project will be disseminated via EUCPN and the Commission should ensure that they also be discussed and presented within the informal network of contact points on the administrative approach. It will serve as an interesting test case for the vast majority of EU MS which at this point in time are not familiar with the concept and even less on how it can be applied locally. The only negative point here is that it would have been logical to also associate Germany, as the city of Genk is located near both NL and DE and this border region is on all sides tested by organised crime.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Innovative approach which is recently put on the EU security agenda. It is in line with our EU policy to adopt a multi-disciplinary approach towards preventing and fighting organised crime, especially in border regions. It is likely to have a direct impact on the local organised crime situation and has the potential to serve as an example to be followed elsewhere in BE and Europe.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Overall, there is sometimes a lack of details and some sections of the project application are not so clearly explained. The budget is one of them. The project is rather expensive and value for money can be improved.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budgeted activities are broadly in line with the project description. The required details (staff, travel, equipment etc...) are only provided to a limited degree. Not all activities are precisely linked with relevant budget lines (training – no costs are foreseen for participants and it is not specified how many of

Annex - Individual conclusion sheets for all proposals received summing up the results of evaluation

participants will attend the training – no info in any part of the AF, TA, budget). The costs for travel related to the international conference for the participants are not foreseen, it can represent a potential risk for non-participation. Value for money is not completely demonstrated.

Number of working days for project (municipal) coordinator, administrator (administrative assistant) and technical ICT are considered excessive and have been reduced to 220. The costs related to editing of final report (6.500,- EUR) seem to be excessive and has been reduced, no printing of this report is foreseen (only graphical design and editing). No offer submitted.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003840</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	POLICE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE MOI OF LT
<b>Project title:</b>	Enhancing the cooperation of law enforcement agencies in combating organised crime
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	ESTONIAN POLICE AND BORDER GUARD BOARD (EE); ROTTERDAM RIJNMOND POLICE (NL); CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, NATIONAL POLICE HEADQUARTERS (PL); PROSECUTION SERVICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA (LT); FINANCIAL CRIME INVESTIGATION SERVICE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA (LT); CUSTOMS OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA CUSTOMS CRIMINAL SERVICE (LT); STATE BORDER GUARD SERVICE AT THE MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA (LT)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The goal of the project is to create suitable pre-conditions for efficient fight against organised crime and improving the cooperation. The project consists of the following segments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Creating the national methodology of serious and organised crime assessment (SOCTA) including methodology to assess threats of organised criminal groups.</li> <li>2. Improving the cooperation with Europol and Eurojust.</li> <li>3. Improving the qualification of the officers, investigating the activity of OCGs.</li> <li>4. Assessing the threats posed by the Lithuanian OCGs in accordance with the information possessed by the interested states.</li> </ol> <p>Experts, investigating criminal acts related to organised crime from other law enforcement agencies, participating in the activity of the inter-institutional Criminal Information Analysis Centre (i.e. State Border Guard Service under the Ministry of the Interior, Customs Department under the Ministry of Finance and Financial Crime Investigation Service under the Ministry of the Interior), will be deployed for implementation of the project in order to create national assessment methodology for threats posed by serious and organised criminal acts at the national level as well as in order to create/ prepare guidelines for introduction of management model based on criminal intelligence information and to train experts from the above listed law enforcement agencies in accordance with the newly established unified methodology for collection, processing, analysis and assessment of criminal intelligence information.</p> <p>Lithuanian Criminal Police Bureau has implemented the analysis of intelligence data and established that citizens of the Republic of Lithuania pose the biggest threat in the following states.</p> <p>Duration of the project: 24 months.</p>	

<p>Partners: Estonia, Poland, the Netherlands. Number of participants: 120 officers from Lithuanian and partners countries law enforcement agencies.</p> <p>I. COMPONENT I (Working visits):</p> <p>- Enhancing cooperation: Introductory visits, practical trainings. Acquiring concrete information related to the threats posed by representatives of the Lithuanian OCGs at the foreign states during the visits. Organizing training practices of Lithuanian and project partner state national law enforcement agency officers at the bureaus of the respective state national liaison officers at Europol.</p> <p>II. COMPONENT II (Conferences)</p> <p>- 2 Conferences in Lithuania (Project team meeting, discussion of the aims of the Project, cooperation actions, discussion of the methodology for assessing the threats posed by organized criminal groups).</p> <p>III. COMPONENT III (Analysis courses) of 4 Lithuanian law enforcement agencies.</p> <p>IV. COMPONENT IV (NATIONAL SOCA METHODOLOGY) creation.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	432.685,7
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	410.685,7
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	94,92

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 70

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 237.136,85 (90% co-financing accepted)

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The goal of the project is to strengthen the cooperation between Lithuanian and other Member States' law enforcement institutions in the fight against organised crime by establishing an intelligence-led policing model in Lithuania. The objectives of the project are described in two different ways: as four segments and as four components. In section 2.2.2 the objectives of the project are described again differently: 1: improving (national) cooperation and drafting operational plans. 2: Visiting Europol to ensure quality of rendered information and investigations 3: Collecting information about criminal acts by Lithuanian citizens. In addition, other deliverables are mentioned in the text but not specifically addressed as project results, e.g. the creation of guidelines for introduction of a management model based on criminal intelligence information or the starting of international investigations during the project. The different descriptions make it unclear what exactly the project will deliver. However, the objectives are in line with the general and specific objectives of the ISEC call. Developing a SOCTA strategy is in line with an EU strategy for fighting organised and serious crime. The target group (law enforcement officials) is relevant.

The creation of a national methodology of serious and organised crime assessment could help to be more focussed and efficient in the fight against crime, especially organised crime groups in this case. The methodology would help to provide the Lithuanian input for Europol's biannual SOCTA report more efficiently (although Lithuania already provides information for these reports, currently OCTA). A considerable part of the budget is foreseen for working visits. However, it is not made clear what exactly the objective of each working visit is and what kind of results will be discussed (presumably investigations or convictions). Furthermore it is doubtful if a delegation of 8 persons visiting several Member States for 5 days each, is the most efficient way to gather information. The dissemination activities could involve more wider EU level actions as information delivered to the respective working groups of the EU Council.

The objective of creating a national methodology of serious and organised crime assessment for the four Lithuanian law enforcement agencies is clear. However, the way towards the delivery of a model is

described in a general way. The role of the national unit of Lithuania at Europol is not described well because it is imaginable that the national unit is supposed to do activities that are now planned in the project (e.g. collecting information about criminal acts committed by Lithuanian citizens in foreign states, their modus operandi and criminal intelligence). Training at Europol needs to start at the beginning of the project. It is not clear what training is meant here, nor is there any indication that the desired training will be provided by Europol at the time appropriate for the project. This issue is not addressed in the proposal. Another risk, namely the availability of stakeholder during working visits and sufficient number of results to be discussed is not addressed.

The presented methodology in the proposal to achieve the objectives is very general. Therefore the applicant should provide a more descriptive roadmap for achieving all objectives. In the budget a working visit / training for 1 month to the national unit of participating project Member States is foreseen for 18 officers. The proposal does not justify why 18 officers should stay for 1 month at Europol. A reasonable length of a working visit seems to be 2 weeks (the normal length of a law enforcement exchange programme inspired by Erasmus). The role for project partners is not clear as the project team consists completely of Lithuanian officials. The project partners EE, NL, PL participate in working visits and conferences but any other role is not addressed. That raises the question why other Member States that will be visited are not associated to this project. It would be useful that Europol is a project partner. The time frame for the project seems to be realistic as the project team members spend only overtime (2 days a month) on the project and there many planned project activities. It seems efficient to have separate coordinators for different project deliverables.

The aim of the project is linked to tackling the OCGs originating from Lithuania. Thus the impact can be reached to the EU MS that face this particular form of criminality. The Lithuanian law enforcement agencies will work according to an intelligence-led concept after realizing the project. This model will facilitate Lithuanian's contribution to Europol's SOCTA. Consequently it could lead to a more efficient fight against Lithuanian organised Crime groups.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The project is in line with the priorities of the call for proposals and other EU priorities. Developing a national SOCTA methodology could contribute to more efficiency in the fight against crime and to define national priorities. The focus on Lithuanian organised crime groups could have a positive effect on the cross-border perspective of fighting crime.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The chosen, costly methodology (working visits) is not convincingly explained to be the most efficient way to develop a national SOCTA model.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs in the budget do reflect the activities foreseen. About 82% of the project budget is foreseen for travelling of the project team and other participants. It is questionable if the planned working visits (in length and number of delegates) is the most efficient way for creating an SOCTA model in Lithuania. These costs include training activities as well but it should be made more clear what kind of training activities are foreseen and how it is made sure that the right officials participate in these trainings (selection). Working visits have been limited to 4 persons and should be efficiently planned to be shortened to two days. Part of travelling could be reduced and substituted by alternative means of communication, i.e. by usage of video conference facilities. Duration of working visits to Europol has been limited to 2 weeks.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003841</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	POLICE DEPARTMENT UNDER THE MOI OF LT
<b>Project title:</b>	Coordinated fight against illicit drug trafficking
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	State Police of Latvia of the Ministry of the Interior (LV); Estonian Police and Border Guard Board (EE); Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania (LT); State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (LT); Customs Criminal Service (LT)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The project "Coordinated Fight Against Illicit Drug Trafficking" is intended for the enhancement of close cooperation among the three Baltic States in the fight against drug trafficking to/via/from these countries. According to the OCTA (Organized Crime Threat Assessment) 2011 report "North East hub" is supplier of precursors and synthetic drug production (Lithuania belongs to this hub). EMPACT (European Multidisciplinary Platform against Criminal Threats) European policy cycle and operational action plans one of the priorities is fight against synthetic drugs. In this project it will be implemented regional response to drug problem not from one state, but from whole region. It will support EU Internal Security Strategy. Regular coordination meetings of representatives of the divisions combating illicit drug trafficking would enable to coordinate investigation actions, plan joint investigations, exchange information available on new modus operandi, new narcotic or psychotropic substances, seek for joint decisions, etc. Regular coordination meetings of representatives of police, law enforcement agencies organized within a country, would be essential in order to fight illicit drug circulation more effectively.</p> <p>Some European countries designate representatives of Lithuanian criminal world as those posing a particularly huge threat to their public order and security. However, the problem of the quality of information is quite often encountered, i.e. incomplete or distorted information is received. With the view to evaluate the state of affairs brought about, it is expedient to go to the countries transmitting the largest amount of information on Lithuanian representatives posing threats to their security and to collect all information possessed by these states so as to objectively assess the status quo and, if necessary, to take appropriate joint actions for the purpose of preventing illicit drug circulation which Lithuanian persons are engaged in.</p> <p>Officers is the key element when fighting against drug trafficking. In the implementation of the project, training would be organized for the benefit of officers of the three Baltic States. The officers would be taught different investigation methods, peculiarities of the use of techniques, etc. during this training. Due to the fact that representatives of the underworld extensively use advantages offered by the modern world (IT technologies), and in pursuance of combating the crime effectively, it is essential to apply modern technical means. To obtain knowledge about up-to-date technological solutions is of primary importance; therefore it would be expedient to attend at least one seminar/exhibition of this kind per annum in the</p>	

course of the project.

This Project will enable us to fight more effectively with illicit drug trafficking. This effectiveness will be reached by identifying key persons related to drug crimes in foreign countries (work visits), by reacting coordinately to the phenomenon of drug trafficking (coordination meetings), by getting newest information on latest technologies for law enforcement needs (visits to seminars/exhibitions), by sharing knowledge's between law enforcement officers (trainings and seminars). This project will raise public security not only in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, but and in all EU (good cooperation).

The last touches with regard to the project would be put by the seminars in the course of which the experience would be shared, examples of the best practices be swapped, information received while attending law enforcement technological exhibitions be shared, modern technologies possessed by the countries would be introduced to officers of other countries and the like. The duration of the project is to be 24 months. The project partners would be LV and EE, Prosecutor General's Office LT, State Border Guard Service, Customs Criminal Service.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	292.657
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	263.357
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,99

**CONCLUSION:** NOT AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 41.5

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

Project proposal is in line with ISEC objectives, actual Call for proposals and Internal Security Strategy, special attention is paid to coordinated fight against illicit drug smuggling in Baltic region which is an important aspect regarding the Internal security strategy. However, the project fits only generally with the ISEC general objectives and 2012 priorities. In particular, the project only aims at improving police cooperation between the Baltic States ('Northeast hub') and upgrading their insights and knowledge in view of enhancing drug supply reduction, even if the EU policy context has been excellently sketched (EU policy cycle, (S)OCTA, EMPACT etc).

Project impact on the medium and long term is not enough justified due the fact that the applicant did not sufficiently explain the overall project conception in connection to foreseen objectives, expected results (not clear) and sustainability. The general project idea is comprehensible, but many details and interconnection between the results in the application form and the technical annex are missing in order to have clear overview about the applicant's practical strategy for the project implementation. Apart from possible positive impacts in the Baltic States and Lithuania in particular, the prospects for the proposed project to indirectly benefit the whole of the EU, are largely theoretical. The involvement of other MS is only through being visited for study purposes by Lithuanian/Baltic police staff. Sustainability commitments (section 2.2.9.2 of the proposal) are rather unconvincing. Seeking ISEC support is motivated only by stating that national budgets do not allow for international projects.

The proposal just lists activities (seminars, study and working visits, training, coordination meetings etc), whilst failing to specifically address what will happen there or why study visits to Belgium, Germany, Poland, The Netherlands, the UK and Sweden are required or helpful. The needs assessment for the envisaged activities is poor: even the proposal itself indicates as a primary risk factor that there will be a 'lack of proposed issues to discuss'. Mitigation strategies do not convince.

The proposal fundamentally lacks methodology (section 2.2.10.1 merely lists meetings, study visits and seminars). The partner network, moreover, is limited to just 3 MS. The proposed measurable impact



indicators only relate to the number of seminars, study visits etc. Numbers of activities differ from application form, technical annex and timetable (6 – 21). No real evaluation strategy is set-up (only general information is provided about the evaluation process). No monitoring strategy is provided. It seems to be more a project about travelling and not about concrete outputs with strong effect. Time frame is not realistic; almost all activities could be extended by 3/4 months, because it must comprise all stage of the implementation (preparatory work, performing the activity, evaluation). The international exchanges need more time to be implemented. The relevant project tasks are well redistributed. Project staff is qualified and able to carry out all duties related to project implementation.

The project proposal covers only a very small EU territory or it is not clear how the applicant expect to follow-up the project in the future on a large scale of EU territory. Information is lacking concerning the multiplication of the effect to other EU MS. It would be suitable to more underline what could be transferable, in which extent and by which way to the other EU MS. It is not enough to mention that stronger control on Baltic region border will have an impact on other EU MS without influencing the EU policy. The applicant and his partners plan to involved to the project activities 7 other EU MS, but there is no demonstrated potential how the results could be transferred to this countries.

Poor geographical partner network span (just the 3 Baltic States), with no tangible added value prospects for the rest of the EU in the short or medium run. No development of innovative or horizontal tools and methods is envisaged. Hence, the proposed project has no transferability potential.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Proper knowledge of current EU policies has been well-reflected in the proposal (EU policy cycle, EMPACT etc), unfortunately without that being mirrored in the envisaged activities. Project staff is qualified and able to carry out all duties related to project implementation.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The proposal fails to clarify what all the coordination meetings, study visits and seminars (representing the primary and a quite elevate cost) are actually supposed to prompt. Vague and poorly designed. No real methodology. Limited transnational partnership. Structural positive impacts upon the entirety of the EU are only claimed.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

Given that it remains unclear what the study visits etc will eventually prompt in terms of tangible impacts, the corresponding cost (especially under the post other indirect costs) seems unaccounted for. Value for money is not well demonstrated within the budget break-down especially regarding the activity – coordination meetings in each country (8). It is no justified why such number of meetings is needed, no detailed content is provided. It is also not justified why 10 days for working visits in other EU countries is needed.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003842</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	ANTICORRUPTION GENERAL DIRECTORATE
<b>Project title:</b>	"Developing new methods for using and protecting whistleblowers, informers and collaborators in corruption investigation"
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	RO
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Public Ministry - Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (RO); Serious Organised Crime Agency (UK)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The perception about the level of corruption in Romania has a serious negative effect on the Romanian image, economy and society. It is not relevant how high the level of corruption is in Romania. As long as it exists, the Romanian institutions will fight against it as there is a zero tolerance against corruption.</p> <p>In its constant fight against corruption, Romanian institutions could use the help of the whistleblowers, informers and collaborators as a fresh impetus to support its efforts. Hence, whistleblowers, informers and collaborators can play an essential role in detecting fraud, mismanagement and corruption. Their actions help to save lives, protect human rights and safeguard the rule of law. To protect the public good, whistleblowers, informers and collaborators frequently undertake high risks. They may face victimisation or dismissal from the workplace, their employer may charge them with breach of confidentiality and they may be subject to criminal sanctions. In extreme cases, they face physical danger.</p> <p>This project, "Developing new methods for using and protecting informers, collaborators and whistleblowers in corruption investigation", having as objective developing the procedural and legal framework of using and protecting informers, collaborators and whistleblowers, will help the Romanian law enforcement agencies to better tackle the phenomena of corruption.</p> <p>The project will last 24 months and it will start with an analysis report regarding the use of whistleblowers, informers and collaborators which will be elaborated by two European experts and will also be including best practice models from EU MS (R1) as a result of three workshops, one organized in UK.</p> <p>This analysis will be starting point for the discussions of the working group set within the project, aiming at developing two joint methodologies AGD/Public Ministry (one focused on whistleblowers protection, another on informers and collaborators) in order to help the professionals, policemen and prosecutors, to fight corruption in a joint and coordinated manner so that better results could be achieved (R2). In order to reach this objective, the two European experts will also provide their objective input and will help with the drafting of the two methodologies and will elaborate the best practices manual (R3). In order to finalize the two procedures, three workshops will be organized of three days each.</p> <p>Once the common procedures are in place, 3 training courses of 3 days each will be organized in Romania so that the new procedures are disseminated to 60 professionals within Romanian law enforcement and judiciary, who will further train their colleagues (R4).</p> <p>In order to disseminate at national and international level the best practices manual (R3), it will be translated, printed both in Romanian and English, in 100 copies each, and distributed both with the</p>	

<p>opportunity of an international conference (R5) meant to disseminate project results and best practice manuals and in electronic format.</p> <p>Partnerships will be concluded with Prosecutor Office attached to High Court of Cassation and Justice and another law enforcement agency from EU Member states for implementing this activity. The project will also benefit by the support of independent experts in drafting the analysis report and the manual. The project has as target groups law enforcement officials and judicial authorities dealing with anticorruption issues and protection of whistleblowers, collaborators and informers. The main deliverables of the projects will be the two common methodologies and the best practice manual, which could be used in daily activities. The project results will be disseminated widely through an international conference to all EU MS and CC similar structures, and also through specialized networks like EACN and EPAC.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	322.760
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	290.260
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,93

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 75

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 228.351,66

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The project is geared towards stimulating and promoting horizontal methods and tools to improve crime prevention and crime fighting as well as witness protection. The target groups of the project are LEA and judicial officials. The project proposal does therefore respond to the objectives of the call for proposals. The objective of the project to improve the fight against corruption in Romania by re-enforcing the legal status of informers and whistle blowers and by drafting legal and procedural tools in this area addresses an important issue which has been highlighted by the Commission in its communication COM(2011) no.308/6.6.2011 on Fighting Corruption in the EU. Effective protection of whistleblowers against retaliation is a key element of effective anti-corruption policies. It would also respond to the recommendations presented in the COM-progress-report on Romania.

The likely impact of this project on ISEC programme general objective is to be considered long term as it will help Romanian LEAs and judicial authorities to deal with informers and corruption cases and to comply with their national anticorruption rules. Developing and assessing methodologies and best practices for the protection of whistle-blowers and informers in the Romanian context is an innovative approach may therefore lead to interesting results which could also be of interest in other EU- and candidate countries. The incorporation of the project results in the National Anticorruption Strategy of Romania will hopefully also ensure that project results will be duly implemented even after the completion of the project. ISEC support would allow to involve main relevant stakeholders in Romania and to count on the expertise of other MS practitioners. Dissemination strategy is based on the final conference and the production of a written and digital version of a manual. Sustainability lies on the capacity to implement anticorruption rules and meet the requirements for Romania under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism.

The proposal explains the objectives in a clear manner and contains a list of activities including training which would be performed through the applicant and its partner organisation. The project also seems to respond to a real need in Romania in the current policy context. The applicant lists some of the risks which it might run in such a project. One major problem/risk – the existing corruption in the judiciary in Romania, which does not inspire trust in the institutions – is however not explored. Existing inherent corruption problems of the judiciary are likely to deter people from “whistle-blowing” and informing. People will only

come forward and report on corruption if they feel that they can trust that the judiciary will treat their complaints in professional and confident manner. The proposal also fails to explain the choice of partners and how policies which might work in Britain can be adapted to the very specific context existing in Romania.

Methodology is following step by step approach in order to establish best practices and protocols to comply with EU Anticorruption policy and rules in Romania. All phases are following a logical procedure in order to improve capacities and preparedness of LEAs and judicial authorities in Romania to reduce the impact of corruption. This methodology seems to be reasonable in order to involve main stakeholders in the anticorruption strategy in Romania taking into account the expertise of other MS. Partners show enough expertise both in the anticorruption field and also in international project management. However, a lot will depend on the quality of the independent experts which are to be subcontracted in the beginning of the project implementation, on the training provided by SOCA and on the willingness of the trained personnel to implement new guidelines and methodologies. Time frame is realistic.

The European dimension of this project is not very strong since it will be very much focussed on Romania. Addressing corruption in Romanian and developing and testing methodologies and good practice to protect informers and whistle-blowers in Romania may however generate positive results which could be transferable to other national contexts. The applicants have therefore also planned to publish their project results in English and organise an international conference to disseminate them.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Clear methodology, clear links between each activity and outcomes to be expected, conformity with ISEC programme general priorities and anticorruption priorities in the Targeted Call, transnational nature,

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The proposal is very much focussed on the national Romanian context and fails to address inherent corruption problems of the judiciary which could deter people from “whistle-blowing” and informing. People will only come forward and report on corruption if they can trust that the judiciary will treat their complaints in professional and confident manner. Not very good value for money since a lot of money will be spent on travelling and per diems.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget forecast seems to cover all the planned activities of the project. There are no staff-costs except for the fees for the independent experts (total of 15TEUR) which are not listed as staff-costs in the narrower sense and seem to be justified given their central position in the project. Considerable costs are foreseen for travelling to workshops, working groups and conferences which could possibly be reduced by using video-conferencing or other communication tools at least for some meetings. Number of participants to meetings has been reduced in order to lower the overall costs; beneficiary can re-elaborate the budget, if necessary by reducing some meetings. Overall the project is not great value for money since a lot of money will be spent on travel and per diems.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003843</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	GENERAL INSPECTORATE OF ROMANIAN POLICE
<b>Project title:</b>	Strengthening the capacity of law enforcement authorities to fight intra-community fraud
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	RO
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Netherlands Police Agency (KLPD) (NL); National Tax and Customs Administration of Hungary (HU); Police Academy "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" (RO); Bucharest University of Economic Studies (RO); Prosecutor's Office attached to the High Court of Cassation and Justice (RO); National Office for Prevention and Control of Money Laundering (RO); Financial Guard (RO)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	EUROPOL (NL)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The general objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity of law enforcement and public authorities to fight intra-community fraud, which affects the national budgets and indirectly EU budget.</p> <p>The two specific objectives of the project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to increase the expertise of law enforcement authorities in fighting crimes related to intra-community fraud</li> <li>- to improve inter-institutional cooperation between law enforcement authorities in Romania and foreign partners</li> </ul> <p>The above mentioned specific objectives will be met in a time frame of 24 months by means of the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project opening conference. A conference for the opening of the project will be organised in month 1 in Bucharest. The aim of the Conference is to inform the public about the objectives and activities of the project. Fifty representatives of the media and partner institutions will attend. For the best results and visibility of the conference the Press Bureau of the Romanian Police will be involved in the activity.</li> <li>2. Study visits will be organized in Romania, The Netherlands and Hungary with the aim of familiarising the stakeholders involved in the project to the organisation and functioning of the law enforcement authorities involved in fighting intra-community fraud. Representatives from each authority involved in the project will attend these visits.</li> <li>3. Training seminars. During months 6 -10 eight training seminars will be held in Romania. Each seminar will last for three days. The seminars will be focused on investigative methods and on improving the cooperation between national authorities involved in fighting public procurement and intra-community fraud. Europol will also attend these seminars in order to offer participants an EU wide perspective on the phenomenon of intra-community fraud.</li> <li>4. A two day International conference will be organised in Bucharest, Romania, in month 20. Fifty Romanian and EU MS participants will attend the conference The Conference will act as a platform for experience and best practices exchange between European experts involved in fighting intra-community fraud.</li> <li>5. Publishing and distributing a Guide on fighting intra-community fraud. It will be published in Romanian and English and distributed to all the interested stakeholders in the European Union.</li> </ol>	

6. Project closing conference. A conference for closing the project will be organised in month 24 in Bucharest. The aim of the Conference is to inform the public about the activities of the project. Fifty representatives of the media and partner institutions will attend. For the best results and visibility of the conference the Press Bureau of the Romanian Police will be involved in the activity.

The beneficiaries of the project are specialists from law enforcement authorities and public administration in Romania (Romanian Police, Prosecutor's Office, Police Academy, Financial Guard, National Office for Prevention and Control of Money Laundering - which is also the Romanian Financial Information Unit, Bucharest University of Economic Studies), the Netherlands Police Agency (KLPD) and the Hungarian National Tax and Customs Administration. The involvement of the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" Police Academy in the project will ensure a wide dissemination of the results of the project.

The involvement of Europol in the project will provide participant to the seminars and the International Conference a perspective on the intra-community fraud phenomenon on a European scale.

The results of the project are 200 Romanian and foreign specialists better prepared and endowed to fight intra-community fraud, an International Conference that will act as a platform for exchange of best practices and a Guide on fighting intra-community fraud, published in Romanian, English and in PDF; the guide will be distributed to all interested stakeholders in the EU. 49 computers and mobile scanners will also be purchased in order to improve the operational capacity of the police officers.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	203.395
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	182.995
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,97

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 70

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 134.793,44

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The applicant explains clearly which are the main objectives to be achieved and by which means this is going to be carried out in terms of type of activities and outcomes to be expected. The project is in line with ISEC general programme objectives. As far as the targeted Call is concerned the project is focussing on financial crime and exchange of information among LEAs and other national authorities combating tax fraud. Stockholm programme and ISS address the fight against fraud among the priorities in the field of the prevention and fight against crime. This is to be considered high priority at EU level. Target groups and beneficiaries are the national and international main stakeholders in the fight against tax fraud.

The project has direct impact on the ISEC programme's general objective for preventing and combating crime, especially fraud. It involves a reasonable number of partners in the field of fight against fraud and will allow to enhance Romanian capacities to cooperate with other MS in this issue. Indicators to measure the project are appropriately based on number of participants, number of training hours and reports produced. The likelihood of continuation of stream of benefits largely depends on the created cooperation mechanisms and their institutional regulation. The involvement of law enforcement training institutions in the project should be considered as beneficial for long term impact. Dissemination strategy is based in manual dissemination, reports dissemination and first/final conferences. If awarded this project should be evaluated in terms of the quality of the main products to be obtained and the number of successfully prosecuted MTIC cases in Romania or the number of joint investigations at EU level. The objectives are explained based on the type of activity to be done, number of participants, percentage of partners involved and outputs to be achieved. It is starting promoting the project meanwhile activities are continued in a logical way to produce manual and trainings smoothly. Most important results are the training sessions and

best practice manual to enhance capacities to fight against MTIC. Deliverables and outputs are concrete enough to conclude that the project will lead to consistent results. This action fits in current developments within Cooperation and Verification Mechanism for Romania. Main risk of the project is the lack of other resources within Romanian Police and other institutions to prosecute efficiently MTIC cases or contribute to Europol AWF. Risks are coherently identified by applicant and risk mitigation strategies have been identified to reduce its impact on the project. The proposed methodology is adequate in order to ensure the participation of main stakeholders on the fight against financial crime in Romania and other experts from EU or Europol. Selected actions are appropriate but first opening press conference could be removed without causing a negative impact as there will be a final conference and a press conference. There is a monitoring and evaluation procedure in place based on indicators such as number of trainings, participants, guide, etc. Project Implementation team will carry out a continuous monitoring but also external audit will be in place. Choice of partners is very positive as covers an acceptable number of national authorities in the field of the fight against MTIC but also other MS experts and Europol. Project team shows enough experience on international project management and also in the field of prevention and fight against crime. Time frame is realistic in order to have time to carry out all activities and to ensure enough time in between to rearrange certain issues should there be any constraints or unexpected events. The structure of the project partly spans across the EU as only three EU MS are participating in the project and the focus of the project is targeted at solving intra-community fraud problems in these countries though the applicant has foreseen adequate dissemination actions and the results of the project could be of value also for other EU MS. The applicant defines that the European dimension "is conferred by the attendance in the activities of the project of specialists from EU MS". The sole attendance cannot guarantee European dimension. Though the impact of the action can reach the majority of the EU MS as the problem of intra-community fraud is topical for all EU MS. The number of the involved EU MS could be larger but this does not threaten the success of the project.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Clear methodology, well targeted actions to reach the defined results, clear impact on medium term on ISEC programme general objectives, real transnational nature, potential span to other MS, involvement of police training institutions for dissemination of the gained experience

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Lack of direct link between the specific topic of the project (fight against intra-community fraud) and purchase of laptops and portable scanners. More EU MS authorities could be involved in order to achieve wider goals.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

In general the grant sought is proportionate though the need for 49 computers and scanners is not appropriately explained and linked to the specific topic of the project. This type of intervention, leaving equipment costs apart, is enough to obtain the promised output as far as preparedness to fight against MTIC crime is concerned. Additional results could be obtained following the train-the-trainer concept or bringing the training sessions to Romanian regions, instead of centralizing them in Bucharest. Number of hours seems to be adequate but all staff is involved in all activities, this should be clarified in order to make differences between different members of the project team. Equipment costs have been removed from budget as there is no clear link with the specific activities of the project. First press conference has been removed: it is not necessary since there will be a final press conference.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003844</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	GENERAL INSPECTORATE OF ROMANIAN POLICE
<b>Project title:</b>	ANALITICAL PRODUCTS: STRATEGIC AND STATISTICS – SUPPORT FOR COMBATTING CRIMES
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	RO
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Department of International Police Information Netherlands Police Agency (KLPD) (NL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational

**Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):**

Objective: Develop a mechanism for producing analytical products in order to support the general effort for preventing and combating crime.

Duration: 24 months

Activities:

- Project management,
- Closing conference,
- Study visits for producing fact finds and status of play in both countries,
- Seminar in Romania - drafting the questionnaire for other MS and the requirements of the test environment,
- Developing, in Romanian Police, and other data bases a closed testing environment for producing analytical products – a real time and live replica of the data collected in the National Incident Reporting System (NIRS) of Romanian Police,
- Particular training for Romanian experts in using statistic formula and interpreting specific results,
- Workshop for developing the first set of analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach based on the testing environment of the NIRS and on the feedback provided in Member States questionnaires,
- Pilot project - implementing the recommendations of the analytical products in selected Romanian police units,
- Seminar for analyzing the results and feedback provided during the pilot project and for drafting a new procedure for producing analytical products,
- Finalize the working procedure for producing analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach,
- Training the Romanian analysts at national and regional level to produce analytical products,
- Training for Romanian police experts in using statistic formula and interpreting specific results (according to the applied formula).

Number and type of participants:

1. Romanian police: 75 (analysts, statisticians, managers),
2. KLPD: 4 (3 experts and 1 project implementation officer)

Methodology:

1. Final Conference of the Project (1 day) - presenting the Project's objectives, activities and results and



<p>also ensuring the visibility of the EC financing;</p> <p>2. Study visits beneficiary countries (4 days each) - fact finding analysis a commune vision upon the road map of the project;</p> <p>3. Questionnaire - the input of other Member States on this topic is relevant and a real asset to the project. This approach will benefit also in assuring the sustainability factor and the up to date procedure of creating analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach;</p> <p>4. Seminars and workshops - open discussions were chosen because they give experts more room to debate upon the topics of project;</p> <p>5. Training - practical exercise, courses on statistics</p> <p>Expected results:</p> <p>1. Knowledge about the extent of analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach at the level of Member States based on the feedback of the questionnaire is obtained,</p> <p>2. The new procedure on developing analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach is set in place ,</p> <p>3. A test environment for analysts to access real time data retrieved from NIRS and other databases is implemented and a commune business intelligence model for analysis in created,</p> <p>4. Analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach are developed,</p> <p>5. Proof of concept during the implementation of the pilot project in selected police units,</p> <p>6. 70 Romanian intelligence analysts in creating analytical products as assistance for a proactive police approach are trained</p> <p>Dissemination strategy:</p> <p>1. Closing conferences will be held in Romania and press release,</p> <p>2. The new procedure for creating analytical products,</p> <p>3. The purpose of the project will be presented during the briefing and debriefing of the police staff in the selected units for the pilot project,</p> <p>4. The new type of analytical products will become a performance indicator for all intelligence analysis units in Romanian Police.</p>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	415.806
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	374.106
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	89,97

**CONCLUSION:** NOT AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 43.5

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objectives of this project are not very clear. It poorly addresses both the general ISEC objectives (the 'analytical products' the proposed project envisages to develop for the Romanian police do not seem to qualify as 'horizontal tools or methods' in the sense of the ISEC objectives) and the priorities of the call and AWP 2012 (especially the link with the crime statistics priority lacks credibility, since the projects does not aim to map the existing Romanian police crime classification system in the framework of international crime classifications in the context of the EU action plan to measure crime and crime statistics at all).

The proposal fails to explain clearly what could be the added value of this project. It remains unclear whether it aims at improving police intelligence by looking at intelligence gathering in other EU-MS or whether its focus is rather on improving the analysis of crime statistics and incident data to improve the performance of Romanian police forces. Given that the focus is on purchasing software and hardware for Romanian police and on organising country visits and training for Romanian LEA officers, its impact would largely be limited to Romania (which, given the fuzziness of the proposed project is uncertain). The prospects for the project to have any meaningful impact on EU level, either in other MS or in terms of

delivering useful, transferable results, are extremely low (there is no genuine involvement from or support platform among other MS). The proposed impact indicators (numbers of participants, reports, training days etc) are non-functional and, hence, do not convince. Given that Romanian authorities are the exclusive theoretical beneficiaries, it seems that national funding (if altogether opportune) would be far more appropriate than ISEC funding. Moreover, the total number of actual participants is, given the budget, fairly low (75).

The proposal is problematic, due its persistent lack of clarity about actual deliverables and outcomes ('analytical products', 'best practices', 'better cooperation' etc). Given its fuzzy conceptualization (the project seems to be dealing with many issues, lacking essential coherence: proactive policing, joint investigation teams, improved access to 'relevant' information, etc), the risk that the project will not deliver tangible, measurable, meaningful and relevant results (at best a 'testing environment' for crime analysis within the Romanian police) seems very high. The risk mitigation strategies do not convince.

The methodological elaboration of the proposal is weak. One remains quite clueless about what is actually envisaged, let alone that the methodology would be clear. The task distribution (within the consortium, which basically is only made up of 3 Dutch police officials and Romanian police) does not convince either, since almost all staff profiles will need to be identified or appointed upon being granted granting the project. Section 2.2.10.1 of the proposal even formally confirms that the project implementation team will only be established at the start of the project, and that responsibility and task distribution is supposed to only happen then. The proposal clearly lacks essential preparation.

The actual partnership is very limited (3 police officials from the Dutch KLPD are proposed to assist the Romanian police in shifting towards more proactive policing through strategic crime analysis). Even though better analysis and better policing in Romania will undoubtedly also have a positive effect on the wider EU, there are no other tangible products/results of this project which could be transferred to other EU-contexts. It remains hard to see, given the vagueness around the actual activities and the deliverables and in light of the fact that intelligence-led policing, policy cycles etc are an *acquis* at EU level, how the proposed project could actually contribute to any valuable, sufficiently innovative transferable knowledge or model at EU level.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The proposal appears to focus on police intelligence as well as police statistics which is an important issue.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Poor fit with ISEC objectives and 2012 priorities. Problematic vagueness around the actual activities and the deliverables. Lack of methodological elaboration and preparation. Insufficiently credible and broad partnership. Doubtful (added) (European) value for a lot of money, primarily spent on IT equipment, programming services and software.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs of the project/budget forecast seem to be comprehensive although not always clear. The highest costs are procurement costs for equipment (1/4 of the total eligible costs) and travel costs for study visits and training (more than half of the total eligible costs). The added value of these study visits is insufficiently demonstrated. Amounts for equipment and the necessity of the purchase of this equipment also remain unclear in the budget forecast (comp. budget heading C). The value (low) for money (high, and to be spent primarily on purchasing equipment and software in Romania) ratio is very low.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003845</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	STATE POLICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA
<b>Project title:</b>	Implementation of ISO/IEC 17020 in crime scene investigation process to develop common practices for evidence gathering in cross-border context.
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LV
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Stockholm County Police, Forensic Unit (SE); Estonian Police and Border Guard Board (EE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Most of the EU law enforcement institutions has identified as a goal to implement the ISO/IEC 17020 in order to advance the work processes of the crime scene (CS) investigation and also to strengthen the evidence gathered specifically within the joint investigation team operations where different legislations, traditions and procedures clash and thus the obtained exhibits has to be credible and compelling to be acknowledged by another court systems. In this regard it is particularly important to foster effective cooperation on obtaining evidence in criminal matters. The ISO/IEC 17020 is internationally recognized and accepted quality standard for CS investigation process.</p> <p>The project aims to build up the capacity of CS units of police forces of Latvia, Estonia and Sweden to implement the work procedures according to ISO/IEC 17020 in order to improve and strengthen the mechanisms for collection of admissible evidence in criminal matters in a cross-border context. The project promotes the development of closer cooperation among CS professionals, specific trainings, also focuses on a role of the CS investigator within joint investigation operations as the strong evidence is a key to the effectiveness of criminal investigations.</p> <p>The project is planned for 24 months and main activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-common trainings, seminars and workshop for CS investigators of LV, EE, SE on implementation of ISO/IEC 17020, maintaining the quality management system, CS investigator role in joint investigation operations;</li> <li>-2 study visits;</li> <li>-2 external quality audits of CS units of LV, EE, SE at the beginning of the project to assess the CS investigation services and at the final stage in order to evaluate the progress reached during the project;</li> <li>-training for law enforcement officials, prosecutors, judges with a view to explain the new approaches by implementing the ISO/IEC 17020 in the CS investigation process;</li> <li>-publishing and dissemination of Handbooks, CDs and standard operational procedures for all stakeholders involved in different languages;</li> <li>-organize and host the European Network of Forensic Science Institutions (ENFSI) Scene of Crime Working Group meeting in order in a wider scope to inform about the project and the progress made;</li> <li>-development of the forensic information management system for CS processes.</li> </ul> <p>Partners - Stockholm County Police Forensic Unit of Swedish Police and Estonian Police and Border Guard Board. Both partners will take an active role in the activities performed. The project management will be realized by Project Steering Group consisting of applicant organization representative and representatives of the Partner organizations.</p> <p>The direct target group is CS investigators and indirect group – law enforcement officials, prosecutors,</p>	

judges, and members of joint investigation teams.  
 Expected outputs:  
 - all together 120 CS investigators from LV, EE, SE educated as well as about 250 other staff of law enforcement institutions trained and informed;  
 -embedded base for implementation of ISO/IEC 17020 in order to develop common working procedures in cross-border context for CS investigation to facilitate the gathering of reliable evidence;  
 -built chain of custody  
 Expected outcomes:  
 -raised awareness on the importance of CS investigation processes in EU level;  
 -improved work of CS investigators within the joint invest. teams;  
 -promoted the admissibility of gathered evidence within joint investigation operations before the courts.  
 Dissemination strategy of the project results and outcomes includes the printing of the 2 separate Handbooks in English, Swedish and Latvian for CS investigators and law enforcement officials. The content will be available also on the Intranet web sites of the Partner organizations as well as on the Applicant organization web site. Materials will be disseminated also during the all events.  
 Latvian State Police will ensure further maintenance of principles, procedures and tools implemented during the project.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	675.310
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	607.756
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 72  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 512.097,30

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The objective is reasonably well defined as preparing the establishment of ISO 17020 for crime scene investigations in particular as regards the gathering of evidence. What could be spelled out into more detail is the concrete stage the project aims to reach in this process. The project tackles an issue of operational cooperation and exchange of best practice between investigators and therefore complies with the objective of the ISEC programme. Although the question of legal admissibility of foreign evidence at court might be overestimated by the applicant, the aim of striving for common approaches as regards gathering of forensic evidence at the crime scene is a valuable initiative. The project is in line in particular with the objective of the call to promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement Agencies. The target groups are law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges and the beneficiary is the public. Those groups are key stakeholders for ISEC actions.

The project disposes of a relevant baseline indicator (unconformities identified during the last external audits of crime scene units). Unfortunately it is not planned to use this indicator for comparing the situation after the project. A series of further indicators is mentioned however without specifying whether or how they will be measured. The project will facilitate the cross-border handling of evidence between target groups in the mid-term, especially when the relevant ISO standard is established as a follow-up to this project. The dissemination strategy as well as the measures for EU visibility seem comprehensive. The sustainability of the project results appears to be generally ensured due to the integration of the applicants in a wider and stable experts' network. The concrete transformation of the envisaged results into the establishment into ISO 17012 is not explained in detail however. Ideally the applicant would outline a concrete roadmap towards implementing ISO 17020 even if this is not fully achievable under the project itself. The

assessment of how much the project progressed on this roadmap would be a tangible method of evaluating its success.

The objectives are planned to be basically achieved through training measures, exchange of experiences and common handbooks. This seems appropriate although the proposal does not spell out the details. The project is going to improve operational cooperation and exchange experiences and best practices. In addition it includes training measures. In this regard it complies with expected results mentioned in the call for proposals. The project links in with FD 2009/90/JHA which sets ISO 17025 as standard for forensic laboratories in the area of DNA and fingerprint analysis. This approach is reasonably expanded with the project to the first step in forensic work which is collecting samples on the crime scene. It is also expedient to include the concept of joint investigation teams (JITs) in the project planning. However, information gathered in JITs is mostly acknowledged as evidence for all involved Member States anyway. Besides, JITs will be set up normally only after the crime scene work has already been done. The risk identification is mostly convincing. The mitigation strategies remain rather general. One additional risk is not to have a concept how to reach the actual standardisation after the project has been finalised.

The cooperation with Swiss experts that seem quite experienced in the relevant field and the conduct of external quality audits is appropriate. The milestones of the project could have been more concrete to be able to measure the progress of the project and in order to keep it on track. In this regard the description of the methodology remains a bit vague. The budgeting encompasses all crucial actions. The time planning seems generally reasonable.

Three MS are part of the core group of the project (LV, SE and EE), an additional country of the Schengen Area is strongly involved (CH), additional MS from the whole EU and beyond will be invited to specific meetings or at least are taken into account in the dissemination strategy (e.g. ENFSI). Although the project has thus a regional focus, the experiences gathered in its course can be beneficial to other MS. There is a general tendency in the forensic community to consider establishing international standards. In this context the project could serve as an example. As a pilot project to prepare the establishment / the use of ISO 17020 for crime scene work, the number of participants is satisfactory. By nature the project is clearly transnational. The immediate impact is regional (transnational) with the potential of being picked up by a broader range of MS.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The project properly fits in with existing initiatives to consider the establishment of standards in forensic work. The crime scene is a relevant complementary element to the standardisation contained in FD 2009/905/JHA. Clear methodology, real transnational nature.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Although the standardisation will certainly be useful, the very need of such standards for evidence at court is claimed but not demonstrated in the application. The same applies to the requirement of such standards in joint investigation teams (JITs). Moreover, the concrete stage on the way to standardisation of crime scene work which the project aims to achieve should have been outlined more clearly. The budget should be readjusted in order to save some costs on activities which could be easily removed without impacting on main objectives

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget reflects all measures of the proposal. The goal of standardising crime scene evidence gathering and forensic work is very relevant. The project, however, only comprises preparatory work to this aim. Against the background of the concrete achievements envisaged in the proposal the amount of the grant requested is rather high. The need to carry out certain expensive activities should be further reflected. Opting for other on-line training options could lead to lower costs in trainings and workshops.

Number of days for the project director has been reduced to 2/3 of full time as horizontal tasks.

Activity 2.1 is budgeted more than 30.000 euros meanwhile if this opening conference is not celebrated the rest of the project could be carried out without affecting the main core of activities. Same applies for activity 9 - ENFSI meeting: this meeting will cost more than 40.000 euros and it is not really needed. A few ENFSI representatives could e.g. be invited to the closing conference instead. While it is appropriate to inform relevant ENFSI bodies this could be done by circulating documents. ENFSI could indeed pick up the results of this project at a later stage.

It would be needed further clarification of the differences between group of activities 10.1 to 10.4 and activity 6.7, as the latter seems to be already included in 10 block.

Equipment is claimed to obtain a Forensic Management Information System which is fully justified in order to obtain one of the main results of the project which is to establish a standardised forensic protocol to deal with Crime Scenes following ISO standards. Subcontracting is needed to acquire certain equipment, to carry out external and technical audit. The leaflets for the public do not seem to constitute efficient spending, the budgeted amount has been reduced.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003846</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
<b>Project title:</b>	The use of existing information systems to increase the efficiency of cross-border information exchange and effectiveness of crime prevention.
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	PL
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Police College and Secondary Police School of Ministry of Interior in Holešov, Czech Republic (CZ); Secondary Vocational School of Police Force in Pezinok, Slovakia (SK)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The main objectives of this project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to conduct activities to evaluate and compare communication channels, as well as their accessibility for EU Member States' law enforcement services in terms of the principle of availability, especially in the context of implementing the provisions of the Prüm Decision,</li> <li>- to share experience and practical knowledge in the field of cooperation between Police and Customs Cooperation Centers (PCCCs),</li> <li>- to evaluate current trends in the field of training regarding cross-border exchange of information between EU Member States.</li> </ul> <p>The final effect of the project will be a report containing analysis and observations presented by project participants, designed to contribute to the improvement of cross-border exchange of information and adjust the training program of personnel involved in cross-border cooperation and information sharing. The participation of foreign partners especially those of them who are dealing every day with practical aspects of cross-border and international exchange of information, including among others Police and Customs Cooperation Centers (PCCC), will allow the exchange of experiences and good practices, which have a significant impact on the development of further cooperation and increase mutual confidence between officers of law enforcement agencies. The involvement of foreign partners will contribute to better understanding of concerned issues, and will be beneficial to the wider dissemination of the final project results.</p> <p>Project objectives will be achieved through the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. - meeting of coordinators,</li> <li>2. - setting up and maintaining the project Network website,</li> <li>2.1 - part-time employment of the project manager assistant for 22 months</li> <li>3. - opening conference,</li> <li>4. - 2 (four-day) seminars in each country involved in the project - 6 seminars in total,</li> <li>5. - 3 (three-day) experts' visits to Police and Customs Cooperation Centers (PCCCs),</li> <li>6. - 2 (three-day) study visits to the European institutions (EUROPOL, OLAF)</li> <li>7. - mid-term project's evaluation meeting of coordinators,</li> <li>8. - closing conference,</li> </ol>	

9. - a report - produced and translated into English and languages of the partners involved in the project - issued in 200 copies,

10. - final meeting of project's coordinators.

All meetings will be planned in detail and prior to joint arrangements. An integral part of project will be visits to Police and Customs Cooperation Centers (PCCC) to learn more about practical aspects of these centers and to provide opportunity for direct contact and exchange of experience and knowledge of experts dealing with issues associated with the exchange of information.

The area of interest during the visits will involve:

- defining the scope of information collected in the selected Member States;
- ways of organizing (administration) databases and access to them;
- law regulations for the operation of databases, including implementation of the Prüm Decision;
- exchange of experience on the functioning of Police and Customs Cooperation Centers (PCCC) (quantitative and qualitative analysis of sent queries, time and effectiveness of provided answers etc.);
- selection and description of training trends/ needs in the field of information exchange and cooperation.

The project Network website will be launched during the project and will be maintained for a period of 2 years after its completion to inform on the project, stages of its implementation, results and outcomes. The project will last for 24 months and will be addressed to officers involved in the exchange of information on national and regional level, everyday users of police data bases and officers responsible for training programmes regarding exchange of information, police databases and international cooperation. The target group will comprise of approximately 60 people. The opening and closing conference will be attended by 140 people in total.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	159.219,84
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	143.297,86
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 76.5

**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 110.327,26

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

This project proposal aims to promote and develop coordination as well as cross-border cooperation among LEAs (incl. Police and Customs Cooperation Centres) particularly in Central Europe in the field - of communication channels in the context of the Prüm decision, - the exchange of good practice and knowledge and - the evaluation of training regarding cross-border information exchange. The proposal is therefore clearly in line with the objectives of the call for proposals. Addressing cooperation between LEA officials between three CEE countries to address methods of cross-border cooperation and communication channels should be regarded as being highly relevant in the context of the ISEC-Programme and the implementation of the Prüm decision.

Improving cooperation, exchange of information and communication channels among three CEE-countries as well as the police and the customs services and training for relevant LEA-personnel regarding issues such as organisation of information data-bases, legal regulations for the operation of databases etc. is likely to generate a positive impact on crime fighting in the region as well as in the wider EU. Better cooperation and training should contribute significantly to improving crime-fighting in the region. Even though the results of this project which is centred on conferences and country visits may not have a long-lasting impact and the main tangible product will be a report focussing on the outcomes of seminars and country visits, important issues will be discussed with regard to the operation of databases notably needed for the implementation of the Prüm decision and the project results shall be used to improve training of



police officials dealing with information exchange. This should address a real need of LEAs across Europe and could inspire future policy making on mechanisms and regulations of cross border information exchange in the EU.

The proposal is concise and well explained. It describes the planned activities in a clear manner and opts for standard project implementation structures/procedures. The applicant organisation, a police college, is focussed on training and learning and should therefore be well placed to initiate and deliver this project which should contribute to improving the skills of personnel involved in cross-border information exchange. This is a valuable contribution in the wider context of implementing the Prüm decision and making cross-border information exchange work. The defined deliverables and outputs are appropriate. The applicant has demonstrated the past and current developments by listing the different EU legal acts for information sharing and this also proves the knowledge of the applicant in this particular field though the applicant does not elaborate on the existing national or international level problems of information sharing. The applicant has defined the possible risks and their mitigation actions in a relevant manner.

It is advisable to reflect on the need to carry out so many seminars or to concentrate them as they are dealing with same issues on the 3 countries and experts from the 3 partner institutions will be present. Opening conference could also be removed to devote the dissemination capacities for the final conference where apparently results and achievements will be announced. The visit to PCCC in The Netherlands, EUROPOL in The Hague and even OLAF in Brussels could be rearranged in order to merge them in one longer trip instead of travelling 3 times.

The applicant organisation has previous experience in handling EU-funded projects. Partners come from a very specialised and homogenous group (police colleges from three MS). The chosen methodology is standard for a cross-border cooperation-projects. The time frame is well planned and realistic. The proposed actions are appropriately reflected in the budget and well planned

The project has a strong European dimension with three European partners and aims to satisfy a perceived need for cross-border cooperation in the field among CEE-countries. The elaboration and evaluation of communication channels and training methods – in particular the assessment on the way how MS follow and implement the Swedish Initiative/principle of availability – has the potential to benefit also other EU-MS and could therefore be transferable to other EU-regions. This could help to facilitate and speed up cross-border cooperation and information exchange in the EU and may thus positively impact on crime-fighting in the EU. The involvement of CEPOL in drafting the training programme and in disseminating the results of the project is recommended.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Proposal is clear and well presented and responds to European needs in the field of cross-border cooperation. Well targeted actions to reach the defined results.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

It is questionable whether the results of this project which centres on conferences and country visits will have a longer lasting effect in the future. Project/budget planning does not provide sufficiently for translation and interpretation.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

The costs of the project are presented in a comprehensive manner. They seem to be realistic. The staff costs are low, while the main costs will be costs for the organisation of workshops, seminars and country visits. Opening conference could be removed without impacting the overall performance of the project. The visit to PCCC in The Netherlands, EUROPOL in The Hague and even OLAF in Brussels could be rearranged in order to merge them in one longer trip instead of travelling 3 times. All in all, the project seems to represent good value for money, in particular since staff costs are born almost in their entirety by

Annex - Individual conclusion sheets for all proposals received summing up the results of evaluation

the applicant/partners.

A very small amount of 100 EUR has been set aside for translations; no costs have been foreseen for interpretation which may be needed. Although Application Form chapter 2.2.8.2 refers to buying equipment there is no evidence of this in other parts of the Application Form nor in the budget.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003847</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	DEDICATED CHEQUE AND PLASTIC CRIME UNIT
<b>Project title:</b>	An Intelligence and Investigation Unit Targeting Romanian Organised Crime Networks involved in ATM and Credit Card Fraud
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	UK
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police (RO)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Europol (NL)
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create a hostile environment for organised fraudsters by targeting the precursor materials and crime enablers that allow them to function</li> <li>- reduce ATM crime and credit card fraud in the UK between 2012 and 2015 by disrupting activities of Romanian OCNs involved</li> <li>- reduce the risk from and impact of ATM and credit card fraud by raising awareness and reducing opportunities for fraudsters</li> <li>- increase the number of criminal prosecution of key individuals within Romanian OCNs in the UK and Romania</li> <li>- increase volume and quality of intelligence on ATM and credit card fraud and human trafficking passed to Europol</li> <li>- target the methods of money movement used by Romanian OCNs, seizing their assets and limiting their ability to fund future activity</li> <li>- reduce criminality and fraud against the EU banking system and the threat to EU individuals who may become victims</li> <li>- increase seizure of criminal technology involved in ATM and credit card crime</li> <li>- increase knowledge and understanding of criminal networks and methodology</li> <li>- raised public awareness of the crime, methods of prevention and cross border working through media releases</li> </ul> <p>Duration: 24 months</p> <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- gathering intelligence and evidence against Romanian OCN involvement in ATM crime and credit card fraud and counterfeiting;</li> <li>- sharing intelligence with Europol;</li> <li>- sharing intelligence with law enforcement agencies and banks across the EU to combat wider criminal activity undertaken by these OCNs such as human trafficking, corruption and money laundering;</li> <li>- arresting and prosecuting OCN members in the UK and Romania;</li> <li>- engaging with prosecutors in the UK and Romania to agree evidence formats and prosecution strategy working through mutual legal assistance frameworks and identifying prosecution jurisdiction where conviction is most likely and penalty most effective;</li> <li>- financial investigations into proceeds of crime / criminal assets;</li> <li>- sharing knowledge, experience and best practice of the UK and European Criminal Intelligence Models</li> </ul>	

with Romanian law enforcement.  
 Target groups: UK and Romanian law enforcement will be co-beneficiaries. The project will involve close working with Europol, prosecutors from the UK and Romania and departments/agencies targeting human trafficking. The project will benefit European banking institutions, EU citizens and EU law enforcement agencies.  
 Methodology: Establishment of an investigation and intelligence unit which uses the European Intelligence Model to proactively target OCN crime.  
 Primary participants will be one Detective Inspector, 7 police officers (UK and Romanian), 2 dedicated civilian investigators and one dedicated intelligence analyst supported by the wider resources and expertise of DCPCU (over 30 staff) and the Romanian Cyber Crime Unit (over 30 staff). Police officers from the UK and Romania will undertake regular two way exchanges in order to support on-site investigations. The unit will share intelligence with Europol and work closely with prosecution staff from the UK and Romania.  
 Results, outputs and deliverables:  
 - dedicated cross-border investigation team exclusively targeting Romanian OCNs involved in ATM and credit card crime for 2 years  
 - investigation and evidential support from DCPCU (UK) and Cyber Crime Units (RO)  
 - 260 days spent by 2 x Romanian police officers in the UK time  
 - 50 days spent by 2 x UK police officers in Romania  
 - 1 x closing report  
 - 1 x conference  
 Dissemination strategy: intelligence shared with Europol will be disseminated to other law enforcement agencies, a closing report and international conference to share learning with EU law enforcement and financial institutions, regular media releases about successes/arrests

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	623.319,64
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	560.987,64
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 79.5  
**Max. final grant awarded (EUR):** 451.679,14

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The applicant has defined several objectives of the project but the overall objective is to disrupt the cross-border economic crime undertaken by Romanian organised criminal networks involved in ATM machine theft and credit card fraud in the UK. The defined objective is in line with the ISEC programme general objective for preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise and in particular fraud. The project addresses the priority defined in the ISEC Call for Proposals: to promote and develop coordination, cooperation and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies. The project does address actual need at European level as the specific form of criminality affects not only the applicant country and the modus operandi of the criminal networks most probably is used also by other criminals in other EU MS. Stockholm programme calls to improve cooperation in cybercrime cases. The target groups and beneficiaries are defined by the applicant appropriately for the set objective.

The applicant has clearly defined the likely impact of the project. For the medium term it will serve as a tool to prevent and fight Romanian OCN criminal activity, in long term - it will promote and develop collaboration, mutual understanding and information sharing across the EU. The indicators for measurement of projects output are defined appropriately, they are relevant to the objective of the project

and verifiable. The involvement of Europol in the project serves as a basis for dissemination of the best practices obtained within the project that will also serve for the continuation in the stream of benefits. The proposed dissemination actions are very targeted and involve not only law enforcement community but also private business and general public. The created cooperation forms and the experience gained and disseminated by Europol will enhance the possibility for other EU MS to tackle this form of criminality in the lifetime of the project and after it. The proposed visibility scheme of the EU funding is adequate.

The proposal explains sufficiently how the objectives are planned to be reached. The most important results of the project are establishment of dedicated cross-border investigation team, closing report and conference. General project results are comprehensible, but could be more developed from the EU level point of view and not only at local level within the UK (reduction of ATM crime and card frauds in UK). The deliverables are reflected in sufficient detail and are relevant for the ambitious objective of the project. The applicant is aware about the developments in the field of credit card fraud not only in the applicant country but also in other EU MS. The main risk as defined by the applicant is the failure to recruit and train staff to the right standard. The applicant has foreseen risk mitigation actions that inter alia include permanent monitoring of the implementation of the project by Steering group and by organising strategy meetings with Europol. The defined risks and the mitigation actions are appropriate.

The selected actions are relevant for the defined objective though the success of the project depends on the effectiveness of cooperation of the involved parties. The different legal systems and different law enforcement training systems of the involved partners can cause difficulties for the applicant to create joint force to reach the set objective. The selected methodology is on average level, especially due the fact that project activities are not sufficiently explained and are bit chaotically set-up. There is no consistency between the application form, time table – C, technical annex D and budget B, the numbers and names of activities differ from each form. There are 21 activities (lines) within the technical annex, 11 within the time table, 7 activities within the application form (2.1.9) and 14 activities under the budget calculation. The applicant has foreseen permanent monitoring system with a help of Steering group and Strategy meetings and involvement of all partners of the project. The choice of partners within the project is relevant and targeted to reach the result. The applicant demonstrates sufficient experience in the specific law enforcement field though the experience in dealing with ISEC projects is limited. The time frame is planned accordingly to the needs of the project, first to create grounds for effective cooperation and then to implement it and disseminate the results.

Applicant did not enough explained the impact of the project to a large scale of the EU; however although the focus of the project is targeted at fight against Romanian OCN in the field of credit card fraud in the UK, the involvement of Europol and the scope of the problem of credit card fraud all across the EU forms a basis for further development of this initiative. The problem of credit card fraud is topical for all EU MS and the modus operandi of the criminal groups can be similar to those used by Romanian OCN in the UK. The number of involved MS is sufficient for reaching the defined objective. The results of the project will directly or indirectly affect the majority of the EU MS and the involvement of Europol for the dissemination of the intelligence is very important. However the potential risk of non-participation of different EU countries at the final conference could decrease the project impact and effects, because no costs for travel and accommodation are foreseen for these participants and now details are provided how they will take part on other activities. More official partner would be an asset if they are involved to main project activities.

**2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

Clear target, well planned activities. Professional background of the project staff. Well designed dissemination strategy. Good impact potential.

**3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

Methodology and budget are not precisely developed. Risk related to the efficiency and quality of civilian

investigators and analysts.

**4. Comments on the Budget:**

The budget break-down could be more precisely developed. Not all information is provided (status: civil servant, number of experts, detailed tasks, etc.). Not all activities are precisely linked with relevant budget lines (training – no costs are foreseen for participants and we don't know how many of participants will attend the training – no info in any part of the application form, technical annex, budget). The costs related to investigators and analyst represent a big part of the project budget but are not fully justified: is it really needed to employ 3 people working almost 2 years in the project? The costs for travel related to the international conference of the participants are not foreseen, it can represent a potential risk for no-participation. As far as the experts/agency under Heading E (recruitment agency, etc.) concerned, no information about their selection and offers is submitted. In order to improve cost efficiency, the total project cost has been reduced.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003848</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	STATE POLICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA
<b>Project title:</b>	Joint cooperation between Latvia and Poland to strengthen borders of the European Union
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LV
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	24
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia (LV); Criminal laboratory of Border Guard of Poland (PL)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>The aim of this project is to promote joint cooperation between Latvia and Poland to develop united system for fighting with the illegal border crossing as well as to educate forensic experts working at the Border Guard and State police of the Republic of Latvia. Republic of Latvia and Republic of Poland currently use their own methods developed within their laboratories. Since Latvia and Poland both share external border of the European Union, it is planned that both countries will prepare common methodology and study materials in order to educate not only experts working at the border and with the analysis of the documents, but also will develop study materials relevant to those officials working with the ID documents on daily bases (banks, leasing companies, councils etc.).</p> <p>The project is planned for 24 months and main activities include: 1. Study visits to Poland and Latvia; 2. Preparation of up to date forensic methodology; 3. Preparation of interactive study material; 4. Seminars for law enforcement officers and officials working at private sector.</p> <p>All together 6 experts- 2 from State police of the Republic of Latvia, 2 from Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia, 2 from Criminal laboratory of Border Guard of Poland will actively participate to implement actions set out in the project.</p> <p>Expected outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>200 law enforcement officers informed about the latest developments and techniques of identification of passports, visas, etc.</li> <li>1000 copied of Handbooks and DVD disseminated</li> <li>Seminars in Latvia and Poland organized.</li> </ol>	
<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	302.362
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	272.124,8
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	90

**CONCLUSION:** INELIGIBLE

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003849</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF JUSTICE - GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION
<b>Project title:</b>	Development of an electronic register of victims of terrorism to support the activities of the Attention and Support Office for Victims of Terrorism
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	ES
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	21
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational

**Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):**

The objective of this project is to develop a register with information about victims of terrorism in order to support the work of the National Attention and Support Office for Victims of Terrorism, improving its response to the victims and facilitating the exchange of information with other Member States.

The proposed activities to develop this project are the following:

- overall technical coordination of the project;
- information system design, defining the technical requisites on data format to be used on the information exchange among partners involved, as well as on the data transmission channel;
- development of the information system and associated IT applications and integration with the web portal of the Justice Administration to allow victims and their relatives access on-line to proceedings and files;
- identification of the users of the system that will have access to the information and definition of their needs;
- analysis of potential sources of information, considering different options for data loading;
- data loading and searching of missing information;
- coordination of the information exchange among partners involved;
- data consolidation and data processing;
- data sending to the victims' database;
- operation of the system

In a first phase, the project will allow other Member States to electronically send information in a secure manner about victims and events related to terrorist attacks to the National Attention and Support Office for Victims of Terrorism. All the information received will be recorded in a database designed to support the operation of the electronic office and to facilitate access to victims or their relatives, judicial authorities and legal practitioners and also to other particular users such as associations of victims of terrorism.

In a second phase, public access to some of the information recorded in the register of victims will be granted to citizens and users of other Member States. Queries to the database will be also enabled to improve the exchange of information among different countries. Compliance with the legislation on data protection is a strong requirement that beneficiaries and other Member States willing to participate in the exchange of information are obliged to respect.

The system development is expected to be functioning in 10 months and it is foreseen an operational phase of 11 months to support to the process, add new data, check information, etc.

Target groups of this project are not only judicial authorities and the victims of terrorism or their relatives,



who are the main beneficiaries of the electronic Attention and Support Office for Victims of Terrorism, but also citizens, that will be able to obtain general information on terrorist acts using a public consultation service.

Expected results of this project are the arising of public consciousness about the phenomenon of radicalisation leading to terrorism and the need to delegitimize the violent narrative of terrorists, as well as to provide technical support to the operation of National Attention and Support Office for Victims of Terrorism. It is also expected that this project aids to raise awareness about the victims and their relatives' needs making possible a larger engagement of the civil society, increasing their visibility and promoting models of solidarity to better define and recognize situations of victimization, including legal recognition and compensation for people suffering terrorist attacks outside their countries.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	321.545
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	278.888
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	86,73

**CONCLUSION:** INELIGIBLE

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PROJECT SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE APPLICATION FORM

**SUMMARY DATA**

<b>Registration number of the Application:</b>	<b>HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/FP/4000003850</b>
<b>Name of the applicant organisation:</b>	MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA
<b>Project title:</b>	Baltic Region Web Media Intelligence Platform
<b>Member State where the applicant organisation is registered:</b>	LT
<b>Duration of the project (months):</b>	18
<b>Co beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	MYKOLAS ROMERIS UNIVERSITY (MRU) (LT); STATE COMPANY INFROSTRUKTURA (IS-GOV) (LT); STATE SECURITY DEPARTMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA (SSD) (LT); LTD EKONOMINES KONSULTACIJOS IR TYRIMAI (EKT) (LT); Compagnie Européenne d'Intelligence Stratégique (CEIS) (BE)
<b>Associate partners/not co-beneficiaries of the grant:</b>	
<b>Characteristics of the Project:</b>	Transnational
<b>Summary (REF APPLICATION FORM: 2.1.9):</b>	
<p>Project aims to implement operational model for prevention of and monitoring, detection and fight against organized international social crime in Baltic Countries (Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia) by monitoring internet media channels, retrieving and analyzing information published in the internet using media intelligence methods and open source intelligence technologies and tools at MOI, national security institutions.</p> <p>Activities: exchange of good/bad practices, awareness as general course for law enforcement agents on the topic to rise up the awareness of threats, boundaries of legal activities and general incrimination process in regards to OSINT and related social vulnerabilities. Development of new work processes for law enforcement agents and solution operators, organizational structures and handbooks, adjustment of existing work procedures in related law enforcement segments. Technical solution will provide set of integrated OSINT instruments and related infrastructure installations required by operational model to support targeted operations.</p> <p>Training is planned to assure in-house competence development, required training modules preparation for continues know-how base development and maintenance. Three phases training program: 1) project OSINT Boot-camp – experts training for project team on OSINT technologies in correlation to project scope and objectives, 2) solution end-users training – training and preparation of solution end-users, operators, other process actors, law enforcement agents and based on operating model, organisational framework and technical solution functional implementation, 3) training program for future operator's preparation – will consist of training materials, handbooks, trainers guide for new operators/process actors preparation, continues knowhow development module that will be organised through the periodical newsletter.</p> <p>Duration: overall project duration is planned for 18 months.</p> <p>The project activities are grouped into 10 working packages and are organised over project phases depending on project interim results.</p> <p>Methodology: project management will be based on PMI PMBOK method; the backbone of the project is IT solution, therefore IT project method will used, as project delivery methodology and will be used OUM</p>	

(Oracle Unified Method) method for standard solutions implementation and development. It will be used platform developed by one of partners organizations - implementation standards from OUM will be applied, all required localisation, adoption, customisation activities will organised using custom-development standards from OUM. User needs analysis, requirements definition, specifications, changes management, implementation in the beneficiaries will based on IIBA BABOK method. Solution testing, validation will be based on ISTQB testing standards. Partnership: PPP model - public partners (MOI, SSD, IS-GOV, MRU), private partners (CEIS, EKT).

Targets groups: law enforcement and public officials.

Results: 1 needs/1 legal analysis; 1 operating IT solution based on user needs and specifications; installed infrastructure; 55 trained law enforcement agents, operators, other process agents; 3 training packages; 1 solution evolution strategy; solution brand, visibility, awareness in EU on solution, its benefits/project results measured by survey; 10 technical workshops; legislation developed; 2 methodology handbooks; 1 document on analysis, developed legislation; 1 guidebook for operations monitoring, 1 measurement guidelines for continues improvement /quality control; solution integration/ compatibility with Virtuoso platform; competence in LT for further OSINT solutions/services development in BC, EU-wide in Russian; dissemination: EU-wide, among BC, exchange of good/bad practices, awareness program, 2 presentations, 1 international conference, websites links on project results, 6 press releases, 1 article, membership and attending to EUROSINT forum 2 events.

<b>Total eligible costs of the project (EUR)</b>	3.673.569,8
<b>Grant requested (EUR)</b>	3.489.891,31
<b>Max. % of EU co-financing</b>	95

**CONCLUSION:** NOT AWARDED

**TOTAL SCORE:** 60

**REASONS:**

**1. Overall conclusions:**

The project is geared towards stimulating and promoting horizontal methods and tools to improve crime prevention and crime fighting as well as cross-border cooperation among LEAs and can therefore be regarded to respond to the objectives of the call for proposals. Unfortunately the project proposal is not very clearly phrased and could have benefited from some conscientious proof-reading in order to eliminate mistakes which sometimes affect the clarity of entire sentences. Apparently the applicants' project is to focus on non-financial cyber-crime which they call "criminal social influence" or "international social crimes" threatening the Baltic region such as cyber terrorism, cybercrime, xenophobia defacement etc. The project would thus also respond to the priorities listed in the call for proposals. Target groups are limited to LT despite the fact that the applicant is claiming that the effect and dissemination will cover Baltic States and EU.

Owing to the blurred description of what is intended by the WMOP platform to detect criminal activity in the Baltic region using OSINT-technology (Open Source Technology?), it is difficult to assess what meaningful impact the project may generate. Apparently the main intention of the project is to create a "basic tool" adaptable to different language requirements to detect threats or criminal activity on the web through media monitoring and structured analysis of content. The development of such a tool – which might need further reflection in order to describe its purposes – may be worthwhile not only in the specific context of the Baltic countries but also in other EU-MS. It remains doubtful however whether the development of such a tool focussing on a wide range of very different crimes can be successfully performed given the fast changing nature of internet/content and the web as a whole. The project could be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of the IT tool but also the capacity to share the intelligence obtained from it and

how this is going to affect other Baltic countries as announced by the applicant.

The proposal does not explain the objectives in a very clear manner but contains a list of activities including training which would be performed through the applicant and its partner organisation. This may be due to the overall complexity of a project involving five partners/co-beneficiaries and the development work which is to be conducted in the project. The project does however seem to respond to a real need for LEA-officers: the creation of tailored software/search-engines which would provide search results on web-activities which would satisfy specific LEA requirements i.e. by targeting criminally relevant activities. Deliverables and outputs are concrete enough. This action fits in current development to settled down EU Cybercrime strategy and the setting up of an anti Cybercrime Center in Europol. Applicant has carefully identified main risks to this technical project and has identified proper mitigation strategies. Main risk of the project is that it is only applicable for LT and not for the other Baltic countries as announced by applicant.

The proposed methodology is appropriate for a technical project. Selected actions are relevant in order to obtain a useful tool which complies with LT police needs. Monitoring and evaluation strategy are well planned and will be covering all steps in order to early detect any dysfunctions or constraints. Indicators to monitor the outcomes cover from technical issues to dissemination activities and trainings. It is difficult to assess whether the applicant is sufficiently prepared to conduct such a large a complex project. The large number of staff involved in the project does rather suggest that there is no lack of expertise but that the project will benefit greatly from a stringent project and management structure including very good coordination. Whether CEIS is the right partner to develop and implement IT-solutions responding to the specific needs of LEAs in the Baltic countries seems also a bit questionable. The project looks rather like an attempt to perpetuate and re-sell the ongoing OSINT-forum organised by CEIS. It is also notable that other Baltic States are not among the partner organisations, which seems strange given the intention of the project of focussing on the special needs of LEAs in the Baltic region.

The project seems to be more of a national Lithuanian project involving private-sector trainers / subcontractors rather than being a genuine transnational project despite its claim to cover the entire Baltic countries. The use of a BE partner is based on the need of a private company based in that country to develop the technical part of the project. Given the above mentioned difficulties with regard to attaining meaningful results, it is also doubtful whether such a project would yield tangible results that could be transferable to other national contexts. After project completion the Lithuanian applicants who involve their security service in the project, may also be cautious about sharing results of such a sensitive nature. The issue of licenses, intellectual property etc. has also not been sufficiently analysed.

## **2. What are the *strengths* of the proposal:**

The proposal has an innovative side and attempts to respond to very specific needs in the field of cybercrime. Clear methodology, good risk identification and risk mitigation strategy, conformity with ISEC general programme and call priorities.

## **3. What are the *weaknesses* of the proposal:**

The project proposal is not very clear and it has a low value for money. The transfer to Baltic region partners is not sufficiently founded in order to assess positively its transnational potential transfer to other MS.

## **4. Comments on the Budget:**

Costs reflected in the budget are linked to the activities listed in the Technical Annex. The project involves an unusual high percentage of seconded civil servants, 33 who will be paid for this secondment and their replacement. The amount of grant sought is extremely high in relation with the expected impact, and value for money is very poor.