JLS ISEC2 Award

Award criteria evaluation

1. CONFORMITY WITH THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES (MAX POINTS 20)

Projects should be assessed on the extent to which they match priority areas identified in Section C of the Annual Work Programme and in the relevant EU strategic documents and/or action plans. Projects should demonstrate that their objectives reflect a clearly identified need for action according to the EU`s policy priorities in the field of Prevention of and Fight against Crime.
- Is the objective of the project properly defined? What is it?
- Is this objective in line with the general objectives of the programme? Explain why or why not?
- Does the proposal by setting this objective address a real / actual need at European level? What is this problem? Did the applicant grasp it well? To which thematic 2010 Priority does this proposal refer to?
- Is there a need for action in this field which would need the financial support of this EU programme? Is there some EU strategy / action plan calling for this action? Which one? Please define. Is it now a low/medium/high priority?

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

17,00

Free text

The objective of the project is defined clearly enough. It is prevention of the misuse of the Internet for terroristic purposes by non-legislative approach.The objective is in line with the general objectives of the programme, especially development of horizontal methods and tools to prevent crime. It is to prevent terrorist activities.I think that the proposal adress a real need at the European level. The problem is usuing internet in connection with terrorism. The applicant grasped it well. The proposal refers to the thematic priorities prevention of radicalisation and public-private partnership.I think there is a need for action in this field which may require the financial support of the programme.The position of the Commission was formulated for example in the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions of 22 May 2007 – Towards a general policy on the fight against cyber crime [COM(2007) 267 final.I think it is high priority for the EU.

2. THE INHERENT QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF ITS CONCEPTION, ORGANISATION, PRESENTATION, EXPECTED RESULTS AND STRATEGY FOR THEIR DISSEMINATION. IN PARTICULAR, THE ABILITY OF THE PROJECT TO ATTAIN THE DESIRED OBJECTIVE(S) WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 25; THE SUM OF 3 COMPONENTS)

2.1 CONCEPTION and RISKS (MAX POINTS 5):

Did the proposal clearly explain how should be the objective reached? What is the methodology the proposal is presenting? Is this an appropriate methodology? Is it possible to attain the desired objective that way? Were the appropriate/relevant activities selected? eg Is a 3 day international conference the best way to achieve the goals or a small workshop would be better? Where there the appropriate/relevant partners selected? Is it planned how the project will be kept on track? Is there a monitoring strategy? Is it appropriate? Are there indicators according to which the project can be measured? Are these relevant/appropriate/verifiable indicators? What are the risks according to your opinion? What are the risks the applicant has identified? What re the mitigation strategies identified?

Possible entries: 0 to 5 points

1

Free text

The proposal does not clearly explain how the objective is to be reached.The methodology was only mentioned in par. 2.1.6. The applicant only points on publication and implementation of the general principles.Therefore I have substantial doubts if it is possible to achieve the desired objective this way. The only indicators are the general principles and the guideline for implementation which are not verifiable.In my opinion there is a high risk of low value of the guidelines and not achieving the goal.The applicant identified the risk of loosing trust from the private sector and difficulties in cooperation between the public and the private sector. The mitigation strategies provided are direct and open communication, equal treatment of all participants and certain skills of the project manager.

2.2 QUALITY OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS (MAX POINTS 10):

What are the results and outputs of the activities? Are these results appropriate/relevant for the objectives of the Programme? Will the applicant be able to deliver these results in this particular action? Why do you think yes? Why do you think no? How will be the results disseminated/evaluated? Is this dissemination and evaluation sufficiently planned? Is it the appropriate way to disseminate/evaluate the results?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

4

Free text

The outputs are general principles for countering illegal use of the Internet with support from public and private parties and guideline for implementation of best practices. The results are improvement of prevention and fight of illegal use of the internet. I have serious doubts if the applicant will be able to deliver the results due to lack of methodology.The general principles will be published on the Internet and disseminated by a press statement and the guidelines will be sent to the participants. Partners from the private sector are not represented.In my opinion the dissemination could be more effective. The project results are to be evaluated by a coordination group.

2.3 ORGANISATION AND PRESENTATION (MAX POINTS 10):

Is the organisation of the operation and the role of partners clearly explained? Is the time frame realistic? Is the preparation of the activities sufficient? Are the persons involved (applicant, partners) experienced in project management?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

5

Free text

The organisation of the operation and the role of partners are not clearly explained. The time frame is realistic. The preparation of the activities may be regarded as sufficient. The persons involved have some experience in project management.

3. VALUE FOR MONEY AND ECONOMIES OF SCALE. SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PLANNED ACTIVITIES, IN PARTICULAR IN TERMS OF ECONOMIES OF SCALE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS, COST/BENEFIT RATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE COSTS TO EXPECTED RESULTS WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 20)

- Is the amount of the grant sought proportionate to the importance of the promised output?
- Does the budget proposal include precise and detailed information such as functions of the staff, units for the calculations (depreciation of equipment, day, month, flight, book, pages, etc.), number of units, etc.
- Do the planned costs represent the most economic and efficient solution and/or the best value for money? Are the salaries, travel expenses and daily allowances in line with the Guide for applicants (For your information, the maximum permitted amounts, for a full-time working day with all charges included, are in principle € 450 for ISCO1 (Project Manager), € 300 for ISCO2 (Project assistant). The maximum flight cost in Europe is € 400, higher amount should be justified. The maximum and minimum amounts for travel subsistence are € 270 (Poland) and € 160 (Cyprus) respectively – for further details consult the Guide for applicants.)? Does the application include explanation on what basis the costs are calculated (other than the Guide for applicants)? (e.g. offers of service providers, reference to previous experience etc.)
- Is this an ambitious project in terms of the number of participants, time frame? Could it contribute to reach economies of scale in providing financing for a priority area? For example it is more favourable to provide funding for one 3 year project which will provide training for 300 people than to provide funding for three 1 year project providing training for 100 people each although the mathematical result is the same 300 people trained in 3 year.

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

5

Free text

In my opinion the amount of the grant sought is not proportionate to the importance of the promised output.The budget proposal generally include precise information.I am convinced that the planned costs does not represent the most economic and efficient solution and the best value for money. Especially the daily rates are very high: 752 for the project manager, 484 for the assistant, 1000 for the consultants.There are no additional information as to calculation of the costs.I do not think it is an ambitious project. It is hard to say if it can contribute to reach economies of scale having in mind the character of the project.

In case the applicant seeks co-financing rate higher than 80%, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why? Why not?

Free text

NA

In case the subcontracting exceeds 30% of the total eligible costs, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why the activity is not performed by the applicant or a partner?), are the indicated costs of the subcontracted activity detailed enough to allow proper assessment? Why? Why not?

Free text

NA

4. THE IMPACT OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS ON THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES AND ON MEASURES TAKEN IN THE DIFFERENT DOMAINS AS SPECIFIED IN ARTICLES 7 (4) (D) OF THE BASIC ACT; SHORT-TERM EXPECTED RESULTS AND IMPACT IN THE MEDIUM-TERM (MAX POINTS 15)

What will be the likely impact of this project on the Programme`s general objective? How would you evaluate the impact? Is the target group relevant? How will the results be sustainable?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

6

Free text

The programme may lead to introduce new principles for cooperation between the public and private sector and prevention and fight with cybercrime but because of above mentioned doubts the impact is not likely to be significant.The target group is relevant.Sustainability was not mentioned in par 2.4.6.5.

5. THE EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE MAX POINTS 20)

European added-value includes geographical coverage of a project but, most of all, analysis and experimentation that lead to recommendations for common models, protocols, guidelines, structures, mechanisms, policies and processes. In practice, it implies that, over and above the attempt to run the project in a number of Member States and build multinational partnerships, applicants must look beyond the confines of the project to find the broader European relevance of the issues, the actions and the output of the project. Every project should end, if possible, with a clear indication of how the project can be further developed at EU level, and with a statement of its potential for European debate and action.

For transnational projects:
Does the project have a real transnational nature? Wide geographic scope of the project, in terms of partners, participants and the target groups, will be favoured.
- Is the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?
- Is there some intention to ensure added value at European level?
- What is the scope for participation by candidate countries (TR, HR, MC)?

For national complementary projects, this criterion is replaced by the geographical scope of the measure they complement. For other national projects (starter measures and other actions), it is replaced by the potential geographical scope of follow-up measures.
- Is this a national project or is it transnational without partners? the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

10

Free text

The project has a transnational nature. The number of the MS involved is compatible with the project. There is some intention to add value at European level.Participation of the candidate countries was not proposed.

Conclusion of the evaluation

Please summarise your evaluation. Please note that it will be sent to the Programme committee for the purpose of having the Member States representatives' opinion and to unsuccessful applicants to justify why they have been rejected.

This is a/an (one of 4 answers)

○ - Excellent project

○ - Good project

○ - Medium project

◉ - Poor project

Strong points of the proposal

Free text

Subject within the thematic priorities.
Transnational nature.

Week points of the proposal

Free text

Lack of relevant methodology.
High and unproportionate costs.
Many important information not provided (ex. sustainability).

If you consider that this proposal should be rejected, please put indicate one or more of the following reasons

☐ The project is not in line with the objectives of the programme.

☐ Topic is a low priority to EU in 2010.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated awareness of the context.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated added value at European level.

☐ Poor level of transnational co-operation.

☐ Poor/insufficient European dimension/participation from other Member States.

☒ Inappropriate or insufficient preparation of the proposal.

☐ Relevant experience of organisation is weak or is not demonstrated.

☒ Conception and objectives of the action are unclear.

☒ Approach and/or methodology is weak or inappropriate.

☐ Expected results are weak or unclear; absence of measurable outputs.

☐ Target group is not sufficiently relevant.

☐ Time frame is unrealistic or badly planned.

☐ Budget is unrealistic.

☐ Weak or undemonstrated procedures to validate output of the action.

☐ Weak/undemonstrated plans for dissemination, exchange of activity results.

☒ Weak/undemonstrated plans for follow-up.

Other

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT FOR THE ISEC DATABASE

Keywords (max 5 selections):

☐ Arms

☐ Children

☐ Crime Prevention

☐ Civil Protection

☐ Corruption

☐ Counterfeiting and Piracy

☐ Criminal Proceedings

☐ Crisis Management

☐ Critical Infrastructures

☐ Customs Cooperation

☒ Cybercrime

☐ Data Protection

☐ Defence

☐ Drugs

☐ Enlargement

☐ Environmental Crime

☐ Eurojust

☐ European Arrest Warrant

☐ Europol

☐ Exchange of Information

☐ Explosives

☐ External Borders

☐ Financial Crime

☐ Fraud

- [ ] Hooliganism
- [ ] Human Rights
- [ ] Illegal Immigration
- [ ] International Crime
- [ ] Judicial Cooperation
- [ ] Judicial Training
- [ ] Jurisdiction
- [ ] Money Laundering
- [ ] Ne bis in idem (double jeopardy)
- [ ] Organised Crime
- [ ] Peacekeeping Operations
- [ ] Police Cooperation
- [ ] Police Training
- [ ] Prisons
- [x] Private Security Services
- [ ] Prosecution Investigation
- [ ] Public Health
- [ ] Racism & Xenophobia
- [ ] Radicalisation
- [ ] Regional Cooperation
- [ ] Schengen
- [ ] Sexual Exploitation
- [ ] Ships
- [ ] Statistics
- [ ] Terrorism
- [ ] Theft
- [ ] Trafficking of H.B.
- [ ] Transfer of Prisoners
- [ ] Transport
- [ ] Urban Criminality
- [ ] Victims
- [ ] Youth Crime

Other:

Please enter other keywords if applicable

What is the objective of the project what are the activities who are the partners how long will it last? Please write a max 1000 Character summary for the ISEC database.

Free text:

The objective of the project is prevention of the misuse of the Internet for terroristic purposes by non-legislative approach. The activities generally mentioned are meetings of the partners and preparation of documents. The partners are: Dutch Ministry of Justice, Federal Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Germany, Coordination Unit of Threat Analysis (BE), Office forSecurity and Counter Terrorism (UK), Centro National de Coordinacion Antiterrorista (ES).
The project will last 18 months.

Déclaration d'absence de conflit d'intérêts et de confidentialité. Appels à propositions pour le programme `Prevention of and Fight against Crime 2010 `

Je, soussigné(e) _____, ayant été nommé(e) évaluateur par le comité d'évaluation pour le programme `Prévenir et combattre la criminalité` pour les appels à propositions susmentionnés, suis informé(e) de l'article 52 du Règlement financier selon lequel: « Il est interdit à tout acteur financier d'adopter tout acte d'exécution du budget à l'occasion duquel ses propres intérêts pourraient être en conflit avec ceux des Communautés. Si un tel cas se présente, l'acteur concerné a l'obligation de s'abstenir et d'en référer à l'autorité compétente. Il y a conflit d'intérêts lorsque l'exercice impartial et objectif des fonctions d'un acteur de l'exécution du budget ou d'un auditeur interne ou d'un évaluateur est compromis pour des motifs familiaux, d'affinité politique ou nationale, d'intérêt économique ou pour tout autre motif de communauté d'intérêt avec le bénéficiaire. » Je déclare par la présente que, à ma connaissance, je n'ai aucun conflit d'intérêts avec les opérateurs qui ont présenté une candidature dans le cadre de ces appels à propositions. Je confirme que, si je découvre au cours de l'évaluation que ce conflit existe, je le déclarerai immédiatement et démissionnerai. Je confirme en outre que je maintiendrai le secret professionnel. Je ne communiquerai en dehors du comité d'évaluation aucune information confidentielle qui me sera révélée ou que j'aurai découverte, ni aucune information quant aux opinions émises au cours de l'évaluation. Je ne ferai aucune utilisation préjudiciable des informations qui me seront fournies.

Final Result

points of maximum 100 points

48,00

Priamos DG JLS - Overview evaluation results

Call for Proposals:	Call restricted to framework partners
Application:	4000001442
Project title:	Clean IT: Fighting the illegal use of in
Applicant:	MINISTERIE VAN JUSTITIE
Member state:	
Total eligible cost:	661.927,00
EC contribution (€):	529.541,00
EC contribution (%):	80,00
Project start date:	01.12.2010
Project end date:	01.06.2012
Evaluation carried out by:	[redacted]
Evaluation last updated on:	14.09.10 10:00:07
Evaluation final result:	70,00

Project Summary

The internet plays a central role and is of great strategic importance for Islamist extremist networks. Islamist extremists know tha t propaganda is a critical tool for generating funding, recruits and support for their cause within Muslim communities. Historically they have used a variety of media channels, such as television, radio and publishing, in order to communicate their views. During t he past decade of huge global growth in the internet, Islamist extremists have made increasing use of this medium. There is now a si gnificant and increasing number of websites and forums, hosted across the world, that promote Islamist extremism. This project build s on the results of the EU project #Exploring the Islamist extremist Web of Europe - Analysis and Preventive Approaches#, that was f inalised in October 2009. The conclusions of the foregoing project comprehend that prevention of Internet crime is of common interes t to governments, security authorities, the internet sector and internet users. Responses must be brought by a number of partners an d include a wide range of approaches.To prevent the misuse of the Internet for terrorist purposes, a non-legislative approach should be developed to address most categories of illegal use of the Internet. This approach will only work if it is based on a broad pub lic support by member states and Internet Sector. This means that all participants in this project are equal, and open and direct c ommunication during the project is imperative. Therefore, building trust is a key factor. Building trust cannot be realised with a # big bang strategy#. The idea is to start with a relatively small group of pioneers, and seek to broaden public and private support d uring the project. The most important deliverable for this project is a set of general principles that tells us what the responsibi lities are, and which concrete steps public and private partners should take in order to fight the illegal use of the internet. Thes e principles will at least be applicable for counter-terrorism measures on the internet. The principles will be adopted by public an d private #initiators# and have the form of a declaration or code of conduct. It is important that the iniators of these general pri

nciples will start a permanent platform for dialogue. This is not part of the project-results, and we hope that the initiative for a public private dialogue to fight online illegal activities from DGJLS, wich was held in Brussels on 21 May 2010 for the second time , will grow out to such a permanent platform. This platform will also make possible that futur changes (if necessary) to the general principles can be managed and adopted. Because the general principles are co-produced by internet industry and governmental organi sations, this project is likely to boost the public-private cooperation to achieve more law-compliance on the internet. There are th ree parallel tracks in this project. The first track is about the draw up of the general principles. Therefore consensus is needed f rom all project partners. This will be achieved through a series of workshops, followed by an editing and fine-tuning process. The s econd track is about the identified best practices from the preceding project. How do they fit into the general principles, and how can these national best practices be implemented in other countries? The result of this track will be an implementation guideline, t hat can be attached to the general principles. The goal of the third track is to make an inventory of new best practices from member states that did not participate in the preceding project. These new best practices will be added to the second track. The estimated timeline is approximately 18 months. The workshop are used for technical discussions in small groups (maximum of 15 experts from La w Enforcement, Internet Industry and Intrest groups, including privacy protection) and the results are discussed in bigger conferenc es.

Signed on Signature

JLS ISEC2 Award

Award criteria evaluation

1. CONFORMITY WITH THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES (MAX POINTS 20)

Projects should be assessed on the extent to which they match priority areas identified in Section C of the Annual Work Programme and in the relevant EU strategic documents and/or action plans. Projects should demonstrate that their objectives reflect a clearly identified need for action according to the EU`s policy priorities in the field of Prevention of and Fight against Crime.
- Is the objective of the project properly defined? What is it?
- Is this objective in line with the general objectives of the programme? Explain why or why not?
- Does the proposal by setting this objective address a real / actual need at European level? What is this problem? Did the applicant grasp it well? To which thematic 2010 Priority does this proposal refer to?
- Is there a need for action in this field which would need the financial support of this EU programme? Is there some EU strategy / action plan calling for this action? Which one? Please define. Is it now a low/medium/high priority?

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

13,00

Free text

The project appears to be in compliance only with general objectives of the ISEC programme and does not refer directly to priority areas identified in Section C of the Annual Work Programme. However, it builds on the results of the previous project supported by the European Commission (JLS/2008/ISEC/029). In addition, the project is in line with the EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism (point 9) and the EU Radicalisation and Recruitment Action Plan – Implementation Plan (points 38-42).

2. THE INHERENT QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF ITS CONCEPTION, ORGANISATION, PRESENTATION, EXPECTED RESULTS AND STRATEGY FOR THEIR DISSEMINATION. IN PARTICULAR, THE ABILITY OF THE PROJECT TO ATTAIN THE DESIRED OBJECTIVE(S) WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 25; THE SUM OF 3 COMPONENTS)

2.1 CONCEPTION and RISKS (MAX POINTS 5):

Did the proposal clearly explain how should be the objective reached? What is the methodology the proposal is presenting? Is this an appropriate methodology? Is it possible to attain the desired objective that way? Were the appropriate/relevant activities selected? eg Is a 3 day international conference the best way to achieve the goals or a small workshop would be better? Where there the appropriate/relevant partners selected? Is it planned how the project will be kept on track? Is there a monitoring strategy? Is it appropriate? Are there indicators according to which the project can be measured? Are these relevant/appropriate/verifiable indicators? What are the risks according to your opinion? What are the risks the applicant has identified? What re the mitigation strategies identified?

Possible entries: 0 to 5 points

4,00

Free text

The proposed set of actions is reasonably well presented. The Applicant seems to be aware of risks involved in working with the private sector Internet industry and proposes a mitigation strategy accordingly.

2.2 QUALITY OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS (MAX POINTS 10):

What are the results and outputs of the activities? Are these results appropriate/relevant for the objectives of the Programme? Will the applicant be able to deliver these results in this particular action? Why do you think yes? Why do you think no? How will be the results disseminated/evaluated? Is this dissemination and evaluation sufficiently planned? Is it the appropriate way to disseminate/evaluate the results?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

7,00

Free text

The final result is clear and the dissemination strategy is reasonable. However, as regards the quality of the end product, this will depend on the level of commitment of the project partners and participants, especially representing the private sector – the key end users of the results. This will chiefly depend on the proper project implementation and actual risk management (see 2.1).

2.3 ORGANISATION AND PRESENTATION (MAX POINTS 10):

Is the organisation of the operation and the role of partners clearly explained? Is the time frame realistic? Is the preparation of the activities sufficient? Are the persons involved (applicant, partners) experienced in project management?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

9,00

Free text

The organisation of the operation and the role of the partners are well explained and the Applicant demonstrates strong expertise in the policy area and significant experience in project management.

3. VALUE FOR MONEY AND ECONOMIES OF SCALE. SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PLANNED ACTIVITIES, IN PARTICULAR IN TERMS OF ECONOMIES OF SCALE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS, COST/BENEFIT RATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE COSTS TO EXPECTED RESULTS WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 20)

- Is the amount of the grant sought proportionate to the importance of the promised output?
- Does the budget proposal include precise and detailed information such as functions of the staff, units for the calculations (depreciation of equipment, day, month, flight, book, pages, etc.), number of units, etc.
- Do the planned costs represent the most economic and efficient solution and/or the best value for money? Are the salaries, travel expenses and daily allowances in line with the Guide for applicants (For your information, the maximum permitted amounts, for a full-time working day with all charges included, are in principle € 450 for ISCO1 (Project Manager), € 300 for ISCO2 (Project assistant). The maximum flight cost in Europe is € 400, higher amount should be justified. The maximum and minimum amounts for travel subsistence are € 270 (Poland) and € 160 (Cyprus) respectively – for further details consult the Guide for applicants.)? Does the application include explanation on what basis the costs are calculated (other than the Guide for applicants)? (e.g. offers of service providers, reference to previous experience etc.)
- Is this an ambitious project in terms of the number of participants, time frame? Could it contribute to reach economies of scale in providing financing for a priority area? For example it is more favourable to provide funding for one 3 year project which will provide training for 300 people than to provide funding for three 1 year project providing training for 100 people each although the mathematical result is the same 300 people trained in 3 year.

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

4,00

Free text

The amount of the grant requested does not seem to be proportionate with regard to the expected results. Indeed such a project requires a specified budget for conferences & seminars, travel costs, publications and this seems to be reasonably well calculated. However, one budget item clearly stands out i.e. the staff costs of the value of 407 720,00 EUR (approx. 60% of the total budget). The proposed daily rates of e.g. 752,00 EUR for the project manager; 484,00 EUR for a project assistant or 1000 EUR for a reporter (external consultant) are inflated, which considerably lowers the value for money ratio.

In case the applicant seeks co-financing rate higher than 80%, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why? Why not?

Free text

In case the subcontracting exceeds 30% of the total eligible costs, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why the activity is not performed by the applicant or a partner?), are the indicated costs of the subcontracted activity detailed enough to allow proper assessment? Why? Why not?

Free text

4. THE IMPACT OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS ON THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES AND ON MEASURES TAKEN IN THE DIFFERENT DOMAINS AS SPECIFIED IN ARTICLES 7 (4) (D) OF THE BASIC ACT; SHORT-TERM EXPECTED RESULTS AND IMPACT IN THE MEDIUM-TERM (MAX POINTS 15)

What will be the likely impact of this project on the Programme`s general objective? How would you evaluate the impact? Is the target group relevant? How will the results be sustainable?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

14,00

Free text

The project's expected results are fully in line with the ISEC general objectives and promise to be relevant for the EU as a whole since the project is one of the few initiatives focussing on the important issue of tackling the illegal Internet content via public-private partnerships. However, since the European Commission has already initiated a public-private dialogue on the very issue, the project and its results should rather feed and reinforce this process.

5. THE EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE MAX POINTS 20)

European added-value includes geographical coverage of a project but, most of all, analysis and experimentation that lead to recommendations for common models, protocols, guidelines, structures, mechanisms, policies and processes. In practice, it implies that, over and above the attempt to run the project in a number of Member States and build multinational partnerships, applicants must look beyond the confines of the project to find the broader European relevance of the issues, the actions and the output of the project. Every project should end, if possible, with a clear indication of how the project can be further developed at EU level, and with a statement of its potential for European debate and action.

For transnational projects:
Does the project have a real transnational nature? Wide geographic scope of the project, in terms of partners, participants and the target groups, will be favoured.
- Is the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?
- Is there some intention to ensure added value at European level?
- What is the scope for participation by candidate countries (TR, HR, MC)?

For national complementary projects, this criterion is replaced by the geographical scope of the measure they complement. For other national projects (starter measures and other actions), it is replaced by the potential geographical scope of follow-up measures.
- Is this a national project or is it transnational without partners? the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

19,00

Free text

The project demonstrates its transnational character, involving partners from four Member States and offers the European added value since its results have significant potential of transferability to other Member States, especially when one considers the borderless nature of the Internet.

Conclusion of the evaluation

Please summarise your evaluation. Please note that it will be sent to the Programme committee for the purpose of having the Member States representatives' opinion and to unsuccessful applicants to justify why they have been rejected.

This is a/an (one of 4 answers)

○ - Excellent project

◉ - Good project

○ - Medium project

○ - Poor project

Strong points of the proposal

Free text

- The proposal focuses on the very pertinent issue of tackling the illegal Internet content through voluntary agreements developed via public-private dialogue.
- The project would be interesting to compliment the work already conducted by the Commission.
- The applicant has significant experience in the policy domain.

Week points of the proposal

Free text

- The project as it stands does not guarantee a proper visibility of EU funding – if a grant agreement is signed, the EU funding visibility must be ensured at each and every workshop and conference. In addition, the beneficiary must open the possibility for the EC staff to take part in those workshops & conferences.
- The overall project presentation could have been done better;
- Inflated staff costs.

If you consider that this proposal should be rejected, please put indicate one or more of the following reasons

☐ The project is not in line with the objectives of the programme.

☐ Topic is a low priority to EU in 2010.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated awareness of the context.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated added value at European level.

☐ Poor level of transnational co-operation.

☐ Poor/insufficient European dimension/participation from other Member States.

☐ Inappropriate or insufficient preparation of the proposal.

☐ Relevant experience of organisation is weak or is not demonstrated.

☐ Conception and objectives of the action are unclear.

☐ Approach and/or methodology is weak or inappropriate.

☐ Expected results are weak or unclear; absence of measurable outputs.

☐ Target group is not sufficiently relevant.

☐ Time frame is unrealistic or badly planned.

☐ Budget is unrealistic.

☐ Weak or undemonstrated procedures to validate output of the action.

☐ Weak/undemonstrated plans for dissemination, exchange of activity results.

☐ Weak/undemonstrated plans for follow-up.

Other

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT FOR THE ISEC DATABASE

Keywords (max 5 selections):

☐ Arms

☐ Children

☐ Crime Prevention

☐ Civil Protection

☐ Corruption

☐ Counterfeiting and Piracy

☐ Criminal Proceedings

☐ Crisis Management

☐ Critical Infrastructures

☐ Customs Cooperation

☒ Cybercrime

☐ Data Protection

☐ Defence

☐ Drugs

☐ Enlargement

☐ Environmental Crime

☐ Eurojust

☐ European Arrest Warrant

☐ Europol

☐ Exchange of Information

☐ Explosives

☐ External Borders

☐ Financial Crime

☐ Fraud

- [ ] Hooliganism
- [ ] Human Rights
- [ ] Illegal Immigration
- [ ] International Crime
- [ ] Judicial Cooperation
- [ ] Judicial Training
- [ ] Jurisdiction
- [ ] Money Laundering
- [ ] Ne bis in idem (double jeopardy)
- [ ] Organised Crime
- [ ] Peacekeeping Operations
- [ ] Police Cooperation
- [ ] Police Training
- [ ] Prisons
- [ ] Private Security Services
- [ ] Prosecution Investigation
- [ ] Public Health
- [ ] Racism & Xenophobia
- [x] Radicalisation
- [ ] Regional Cooperation
- [ ] Schengen
- [ ] Sexual Exploitation
- [ ] Ships
- [ ] Statistics
- [x] Terrorism
- [ ] Theft
- [ ] Trafficking of H.B.
- [ ] Transfer of Prisoners
- [ ] Transport
- [ ] Urban Criminality
- [ ] Victims
- [ ] Youth Crime

Other:

Public private dialogue.

What is the objective of the project what are the activities who are the partners how long will it last? Please write a max 1000 Character summary for the ISEC database.

Free text:

Objectives:
- To prevent the misuse of the Internet for terroristic purposes and other categories of illegal use of the Internet through a non-legislative approach.

Activities:
- interviews, workshops, conferences, producing/publishing handbooks and guidelines.

Partners:
- Governmental organisations from BE, DE, ES and UK.

Duration:
- 18 months.

Déclaration d'absence de conflit d'intérêts et de confidentialité. Appels à propositions pour le programme `Prevention of and Fight against Crime 2010 `

Je, soussigné(e) _____, ayant été nommé(e) évaluateur par le comité d'évaluation pour le programme `Prévenir et combattre la criminalité` pour les appels à propositions susmentionnés, suis informé(e) de l'article 52 du Règlement financier selon lequel: « Il est interdit à tout acteur financier d'adopter tout acte d'exécution du budget à l'occasion duquel ses propres intérêts pourraient être en conflit avec ceux des Communautés. Si un tel cas se présente, l'acteur concerné a l'obligation de s'abstenir et d'en référer à l'autorité compétente. Il y a conflit d'intérêts lorsque l'exercice impartial et objectif des fonctions d'un acteur de l'exécution du budget ou d'un auditeur interne ou d'un évaluateur est compromis pour des motifs familiaux, d'affinité politique ou nationale, d'intérêt économique ou pour tout autre motif de communauté d'intérêt avec le bénéficiaire. » Je déclare par la présente que, à ma connaissance, je n'ai aucun conflit d'intérêts avec les opérateurs qui ont présenté une candidature dans le cadre de ces appels à propositions. Je confirme que, si je découvre au cours de l'évaluation que ce conflit existe, je le déclarerai immédiatement et démissionnerai. Je confirme en outre que je maintiendrai le secret professionnel. Je ne communiquerai en dehors du comité d'évaluation aucune information confidentielle qui me sera révélée ou que j'aurai découverte, ni aucune information quant aux opinions émises au cours de l'évaluation. Je ne ferai aucune utilisation préjudiciable des informations qui me seront fournies.

Final Result

points of maximum 100 points

70,00

Extra Evaluation Appl: Award: 4000001442

Date: 05.10.2010 12:20:33
Version: 0000000009
Evaluator: [redacted]

Award criteria evaluation

1. CONFORMITY WITH THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES (MAX POINTS 20)

Projects should be assessed on the extent to which they match priority areas identified in Section C of the Annual Work Programme and in the relevant EU strategic documents and/or action plans. Projects should demonstrate that their objectives reflect a clearly identified need for action according to the EU`s policy priorities in the field of Prevention of and Fight against Crime.
- Is the objective of the project properly defined? What is it?
- Is this objective in line with the general objectives of the programme? Explain why or why not?
- Does the proposal by setting this objective address a real / actual need at European level? What is this problem? Did the applicant grasp it well? To which thematic 2010 Priority does this proposal refer to?
- Is there a need for action in this field which would need the financial support of this EU programme? Is there some EU strategy / action plan calling for this action? Which one? Please define. Is it now a low/medium/high priority?

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

15,00

Free text

The aim of the proposal is to establish general principles possibly in the form of a code of conduct which will guide public-private cooperation in countering terrorist use of the internet. The proposal is in line with what has been laid down in the Stockholm programme and the annual work programme of the Commission. Public-Private dialogue to address terrorist internet use is vital to make progress in this area and sensitise the private sector to the concerns of law enforcement which is confronted with terrorists turning to the internet as their medium of choice to spread propaganda, recruit followers, communicate, train and raise funds for their activities.

2. THE INHERENT QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES IN TERMS OF ITS CONCEPTION, ORGANISATION, PRESENTATION, EXPECTED RESULTS AND STRATEGY FOR THEIR DISSEMINATION. IN PARTICULAR, THE ABILITY OF THE PROJECT TO ATTAIN THE DESIRED OBJECTIVE(S) WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 25; THE SUM OF 3 COMPONENTS)

2.1 CONCEPTION and RISKS (MAX POINTS 5):

Did the proposal clearly explain how should be the objective reached? What is the methodology the proposal is presenting? Is this an appropriate methodology? Is it possible to attain the desired objective that way? Were the appropriate/relevant activities selected? eg Is a 3 day international conference the best way to achieve the goals or a small workshop would be better? Where there the appropriate/relevant partners selected? Is it planned how the project will be kept on track? Is there a monitoring strategy? Is it appropriate? Are there indicators according to which the project can be measured? Are these relevant/appropriate/verifiable indicators? What are the risks according to your opinion? What are the risks the applicant has identified? What re the mitigation strategies identified?

Possible entries: 0 to 5 points

2,00

Free text

The information about the methodology which is to be adopted to reach the above mentioned objective is quite poor. The applicant does in particular not really explain how private sector involvement will look like and how his efforts will complement ongoing work at EU-level to develop a public-private code of conduct to address illegal internet use - an initiative he refers to in the project description. The proposal focusses on the terrorism aspects which could form a part of these broader efforts. Although the applicant identifies loosing trust from the private sector as a key issue, he does not really explain how he wants to gain this trust in the first place.

2.2 QUALITY OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS (MAX POINTS 10):

What are the results and outputs of the activities? Are these results appropriate/relevant for the objectives of the Programme? Will the applicant be able to deliver these results in this particular action? Why do you think yes? Why do you think no? How will be the results disseminated/evaluated? Is this dissemination and evaluation sufficiently planned? Is it the appropriate way to disseminate/evaluate the results?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

7,00

Free text

If the proposed result of establishing general principles to address terrorist or other illegal use of the internet can be achieved between private sector and law enforcement this would have to be regarded as a major breakthrough. With regard to the methodological weakness of the proposal it remains however questionable whether these results can really be achieved.

2.3 ORGANISATION AND PRESENTATION (MAX POINTS 10):

Is the organisation of the operation and the role of partners clearly explained? Is the time frame realistic? Is the preparation of the activities sufficient? Are the persons involved (applicant, partners) experienced in project management?

Possible entries: 0 to 10 points

8,00

Free text

The applicant has a team of strong partners and has previous experience in managing and participating international projects. He is well placed to manage the project which would however require better and more thorough preparation (s.a.)

3. VALUE FOR MONEY AND ECONOMIES OF SCALE. SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PLANNED ACTIVITIES, IN PARTICULAR IN TERMS OF ECONOMIES OF SCALE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS, COST/BENEFIT RATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THE COSTS TO EXPECTED RESULTS WILL BE ASSESSED (MAX POINTS 20)

- Is the amount of the grant sought proportionate to the importance of the promised output?
- Does the budget proposal include precise and detailed information such as functions of the staff, units for the calculations (depreciation of equipment, day, month, flight, book, pages, etc.), number of units, etc.
- Do the planned costs represent the most economic and efficient solution and/or the best value for money? Are the salaries, travel expenses and daily allowances in line with the Guide for applicants (For your information, the maximum permitted amounts, for a full-time working day with all charges included, are in principle € 450 for ISCO1 (Project Manager), € 300 for ISCO2 (Project assistant). The maximum flight cost in Europe is € 400, higher amount should be justified. The maximum and minimum amounts for travel subsistence are € 270 (Poland) and € 160 (Cyprus) respectively – for further details consult the Guide for applicants.)? Does the application include explanation on what basis the costs are calculated (other than the Guide for applicants)? (e.g. offers of service providers, reference to previous experience etc.)
- Is this an ambitious project in terms of the number of participants, time frame? Could it contribute to reach economies of scale in providing financing for a priority area? For example it is more favourable to provide funding for one 3 year project which will provide training for 300 people than to provide funding for three 1 year project providing training for 100 people each although the mathematical result is the same 300 people trained in 3 year.

Possible entries: 0 to 20 points

7,00

Free text

The project is ambitious and involves 200 participants from 5 MS. Costs are high and staff cost are much higher than what is considered appropriate

In case the applicant seeks co-financing rate higher than 80%, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why? Why not?

Free text

In case the subcontracting exceeds 30% of the total eligible costs, please assess the justification provided. Is it convincing? Why the activity is not performed by the applicant or a partner?), are the indicated costs of the subcontracted activity detailed enough to allow proper assessment? Why? Why not?

Free text

4. THE IMPACT OF THE EXPECTED RESULTS ON THE ISEC PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES AND ON MEASURES TAKEN IN THE DIFFERENT DOMAINS AS SPECIFIED IN ARTICLES 7 (4) (D) OF THE BASIC ACT; SHORT-TERM EXPECTED RESULTS AND IMPACT IN THE MEDIUM-TERM (MAX POINTS 15)

What will be the likely impact of this project on the Programme`s general objective? How would you evaluate the impact? Is the target group relevant? How will the results be sustainable?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

12,00

Free text

If the project is successful it will have considerable impact despite the fact that the disseminatiion strategy could still be improved.

5. THE EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE MAX POINTS 20)

European added-value includes geographical coverage of a project but, most of all, analysis and experimentation that lead to recommendations for common models, protocols, guidelines, structures, mechanisms, policies and processes. In practice, it implies that, over and above the attempt to run the project in a number of Member States and build multinational partnerships, applicants must look beyond the confines of the project to find the broader European relevance of the issues, the actions and the output of the project. Every project should end, if possible, with a clear indication of how the project can be further developed at EU level, and with a statement of its potential for European debate and action.

For transnational projects:
Does the project have a real transnational nature? Wide geographic scope of the project, in terms of partners, participants and the target groups, will be favoured.
- Is the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?
- Is there some intention to ensure added value at European level?
- What is the scope for participation by candidate countries (TR, HR, MC)?

For national complementary projects, this criterion is replaced by the geographical scope of the measure they complement. For other national projects (starter measures and other actions), it is replaced by the potential geographical scope of follow-up measures.
- Is this a national project or is it transnational without partners? the number of the MS involved compatible with the project?

Possible entries: 0 to 15 points

15,00

Free text

Strong partners and truely European dimension, since the general principles would become a guidance document for the whole EU

Conclusion of the evaluation

Please summarise your evaluation. Please note that it will be sent to the Programme committee for the purpose of having the Member States representatives' opinion and to unsuccessful applicants to justify why they have been rejected.

This is a/an (one of 4 answers)

○ - Excellent project

○ - Good project

◉ - Medium project

○ - Poor project

Strong points of the proposal

Free text

Good objective and good team of partners

Week points of the proposal

Free text

Project-methodology is poor, staff costs are inflated

If you consider that this proposal should be rejected, please put indicate one or more of the following reasons

☐ The project is not in line with the objectives of the programme.

☐ Topic is a low priority to EU in 2010.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated awareness of the context.

☐ Poor or undemonstrated added value at European level.

☐ Poor level of transnational co-operation.

☐ Poor/insufficient European dimension/participation from other Member States.

☐ Inappropriate or insufficient preparation of the proposal.

☐ Relevant experience of organisation is weak or is not demonstrated.

☐ Conception and objectives of the action are unclear.

☐ Approach and/or methodology is weak or inappropriate.

☐ Expected results are weak or unclear; absence of measurable outputs.

☐ Target group is not sufficiently relevant.

☐ Time frame is unrealistic or badly planned.

☐ Budget is unrealistic.

☐ Weak or undemonstrated procedures to validate output of the action.

☐ Weak/undemonstrated plans for dissemination, exchange of activity results.

☐ Weak/undemonstrated plans for follow-up.

Other

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT FOR THE ISEC DATABASE

Keywords (max 5 selections):

- ☐ Arms
- ☐ Children
- ☐ Crime Prevention
- ☐ Civil Protection
- ☐ Corruption
- ☐ Counterfeiting and Piracy
- ☐ Criminal Proceedings
- ☐ Crisis Management
- ☐ Critical Infrastructures
- ☐ Customs Cooperation
- ☒ Cybercrime
- ☐ Data Protection
- ☐ Defence
- ☐ Drugs
- ☐ Enlargement
- ☐ Environmental Crime
- ☐ Eurojust
- ☐ European Arrest Warrant
- ☐ Europol
- ☐ Exchange of Information
- ☐ Explosives
- ☐ External Borders
- ☐ Financial Crime
- ☐ Fraud
- ☐ Hooliganism
- ☐ Human Rights
- ☐ Illegal Immigration
- ☐ International Crime

- [ ] Judicial Cooperation
- [ ] Judicial Training
- [ ] Jurisdiction
- [ ] Money Laundering
- [ ] Ne bis in idem (double jeopardy)
- [ ] Organised Crime
- [ ] Peacekeeping Operations
- [ ] Police Cooperation
- [ ] Police Training
- [ ] Prisons
- [ ] Private Security Services
- [ ] Prosecution Investigation
- [ ] Public Health
- [ ] Racism & Xenophobia
- [x] Radicalisation
- [ ] Regional Cooperation
- [ ] Schengen
- [ ] Sexual Exploitation
- [ ] Ships
- [ ] Statistics
- [x] Terrorism
- [ ] Theft
- [ ] Trafficking of H.B.
- [ ] Transfer of Prisoners
- [ ] Transport
- [ ] Urban Criminality
- [ ] Victims
- [ ] Youth Crime

Other:

Please enter other keywords if applicable

What is the objective of the project what are the activities who are the partners how long will it last? Please write a max 1000 Character summary for the ISEC database.

Free text:

The objective of the project is to improve cooperation mechanism between law-enforcement and privat sector partners by addressing the criminal and terrorist use of the internet. In order to achieve this objective the applicant wants to establish a public-private negotiation platform which should lead to the adoption of a code of conduct/general principles to guide public-private cooperation in adressing criminal phenomena on the internet. The project is planned for two and a half years and will involve five main partners: the Dutch Nctb as applicant, the German Federal Ministry of Interior, the Belgian Unit for threat Analysis, the UK Office for Security and Counter Terrorism and the Spanish Centro Nacional de Coordinacion Antiterrorista. Europol will be an associate partner.

Déclaration d'absence de conflit d'intérêts et de confidentialité. Appels à propositions pour le programme `Prevention of and Fight against Crime 2010 `

Je, soussigné(e) _____, ayant été nommé(e) évaluateur par le comité d'évaluation pour le programme `Prévenir et combattre la criminalité` pour les appels à propositions susmentionnés, suis informé(e) de l'article 52 du Règlement financier selon lequel: « Il est interdit à tout acteur financier d'adopter tout acte d'exécution du budget à l'occasion duquel ses propres intérêts pourraient être en conflit avec ceux des Communautés. Si un tel cas se présente, l'acteur concerné a l'obligation de s'abstenir et d'en référer à l'autorité compétente. Il y a conflit d'intérêts lorsque l'exercice impartial et objectif des fonctions d'un acteur de l'exécution du budget ou d'un auditeur interne ou d'un évaluateur est compromis pour des motifs familiaux, d'affinité politique ou nationale, d'intérêt économique ou pour tout autre motif de communauté d'intérêt avec le bénéficiaire. » Je déclare par la présente que, à ma connaissance, je n'ai aucun conflit d'intérêts avec les opérateurs qui ont présenté une candidature dans le cadre de ces appels à propositions. Je confirme que, si je découvre au cours de l'évaluation que ce conflit existe, je le déclarerai immédiatement et démissionnerai. Je confirme en outre que je maintiendrai le secret professionnel. Je ne communiquerai en dehors du comité d'évaluation aucune information confidentielle qui me sera révélée ou que j'aurai découverte, ni aucune information quant aux opinions émises au cours de l'évaluation. Je ne ferai aucune utilisation préjudiciable des informations qui me seront fournies.

Final Result

points of maximum 100 points

66,00