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1. **INTRODUCTION**

For two decades now, all the Union Member States have been confronted with a diversifying phenomenon of crime on an alarming scale, targeting citizens and their property, the business world and the public sector. This phenomenon is expensive to our societies (human cost for the victims, social and political cost, economic cost). Globalisation and the opening of markets in goods, services and capital have operated as unprecedented growth factors in Europe, but they have also facilitated an expansion of cross-border organised crime.

Often developing independently of crime itself, the sense of insecurity is a matter for the individual or collective perception of the citizens. This sense does not necessarily correspond to reality, but it is, however, fundamental in the Union citizens’ assessment of their quality of life.

Against this backdrop, the authorities have become aware of the limits to the traditional enforcement measures of judicial systems and developed supplementary crime prevention initiatives, albeit in differing degrees.

The European Union has been working on crime prevention since 1996. The Stockholm conference, for instance, examined the prevention of crime connected with European economic integration but also the prevention of crime connected with social exclusion. Several seminars followed (Brussels, 1996; Nordwijk, 1997; London, 1998), constituting successive stages of the development of a Union approach to prevention. One of the main recommendations has concerned the need to develop exchanges of national know-how and experience. This question of the exchange of good practices has recurred regularly and been at the focus of cooperation against crime.

Regarding the fight against organised crime, where the European Union’s activities are more highly developed, the Plan of Action adopted by the Amsterdam European Council in 1997 calls, among other things, for preventive measures to back up enforcement measures. The Union’s strategy for the beginning of the new millennium, adopted on 29 March 2000 by way of follow-up to the 1997 Plan of Action, further reinforces this dimension.

The Amsterdam Treaty gives the European Union the possibility of taking more general and more determined action. The purpose of this communication is to contribute to the debate on the European crime prevention policy launched by the Portuguese Presidency of the Council at Praia da Falésia on 4 and 5 May this year. There the Commission announced its intention of preparing a communication on crime prevention, including proposals for a Community financial instrument. That is the subject-matter of this document, which will be sent for consultation to all the institutions and bodies concerned.

---

2. **CONTEXT AND DEFINITIONS**

2.1. **The legal and political context**

*The Treaty of Amsterdam and the Tampere European Council*

The Amsterdam Treaty marked an important stage; Article 29 included the prevention of crime in general (whether organised or otherwise) among the policies of the Union for the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice. The issue of crime prevention, hitherto addressed in terms of organised crime, must now be addressed in more general terms.

The Tampere European Council stressed the importance of this objective at points 41 and 42 of its conclusions:

‘41. The European Council calls for the integration of crime prevention aspects into actions against crime as well as for the further development of national crime prevention programmes. Common priorities should be developed and identified in crime prevention in the external and internal policy of the Union and be taken into account when preparing new legislation.

42. The exchange of best practices should be developed, the network of competent national authorities for crime prevention and cooperation between national crime prevention organisations should be strengthened and the possibility of a Community funded programme should be explored for these purposes. The first priorities for this cooperation could be juvenile, urban and drug-related crime.’

The European Parliament has repeatedly asked the Council and the Member States to take initiatives for the prevention of crime, and in particular drug-related urban crime.

*The Praia da Falésia Conference*

The Portuguese Presidency organised a ministerial conference on 4 and 5 May 2000 to launch a debate on the utilisation of the possibilities offered by the Amsterdam Treaty and the action to be taken on the conclusions of the Tampere European Council. It was an opportunity to:

– take stock of initiatives, projects and views of the bodies of the European Union and of international organisations;

– review the situation in the European Union on the basis of a first survey of national experience;

– identify certain guidelines for future action on prevention in the European Union.

Given the links between organised crime and crime in general, the Conference concluded that a European crime prevention strategy should cover both aspects, even if specific action was called for in relation to organised crime.

*The Council Resolution on prevention of organised crime*

Following the initial recommendations on the prevention of organised crime in the 1997 Plan of Action, the Council wished the Union to go further down this road. In a Resolution adopted in December 1998 it called on the Commission and Europol to work together on preparing a
report by the end of 2000 with proposals for European initiatives on the prevention of organised crime. This report is to add practical proposals to the points made in the strategy for the new millennium.

A first seminar involving representatives of the public authorities, the academic world and business and representatives of civil society was organised at The Hague in November 1999. A second conference, prepared by the Portuguese Presidency, the Commission and Europol at Costa da Caparica in May 2000 continued the dialogue started in The Hague and fleshed out the elements of a European strategy. In the more specific field of drugs, the Finnish Presidency organised a Conference in July 1999 covering the role of the enforcement authorities in prevention.

The Commission and Europol working paper which will be presented later proceeds from the conclusions of these seminars, from a review of practices in the Member States and from the results of specific studies financed by the Falcone Programme. It will propose a strategy based on the analysis and prevention of opportunities for crime on the basis of structures for study and data analysis concerning organised crime that are needed to increase the crime-prevention capacity of the European institutions and the Member States.

**Prevention in the work of the European Community and the international Community**

The European Union has regularly addressed the question of crime prevention, initially in connection with certain types of crime such as trafficking in human beings and the sexual exploitation of children but also in horizontal terms, for example in:

- the Commission Communication of 14 July 1999 on the victims of crime in the European Union;

- the Commission Communication on the mutual recognition of final judgments, which covers two areas that are relevant to prevention – the mutual recognition of certain disqualification measures and the mutual recognition of criminal convictions;

- the European Union Action Plan against Drugs (2000-04), a major dimension of which is prevention of drug-addiction and dealing;

- the Commission Communication on fraud against the Community budget, approved on 28 June this year, which lays down a comprehensive strategy. That subject is accordingly not addressed in this Communication. Implementation of this comprehensive strategy foresees the strengthening of community texts in order to make them more resistant to fraud, as well as the development of a cooperative culture favourable to the prevention of corruption.

The Commission considers that it is also important to take advantage of the work and experience of the various international bodies and to secure consistency between the action of the European Union and the action of, in particular, the Council of Europe and the United Nations. This multilateral dimension is of particular importance in the fight against transnational organised crime, and in this context the United Nations Convention and the Protocols to it (the Commission has been fully involved in negotiating them) will offer a valuable general framework for reinforcing international cooperation.

This work and these ideas have prompted the Commission to adopt an overall approach in this communication, which presents a strategy for the prevention of all forms of crime.
2.2. Definitions

2.2.1. The concept of crime

Crime includes punishable conduct by individuals and by spontaneous associations of persons. The concept, however, covers separate realities:

- crime in the strict sense, i.e. offences defined as such in national criminal laws (e.g. homicide, rape, certain illegal trafficking);

- less serious offences that are actually more frequent (e.g. theft, handling stolen goods, acts of violence, fraud, embezzlement);

- violence in various contexts (schools, sports stadiums, public highways, domestic violence etc.);

- anti-social conduct which, without necessarily being a criminal offence, can by its cumulative effect generate a climate of tension and insecurity.

Organised crime is in a category of its own, defined by Article 1 of the Joint Action on making it a criminal offence to participate in a criminal organisation in the Member States of the European Union of 21 December 1998:

- a criminal organisation shall mean a structured association, established over a period of time, of more than two persons, acting in concert with a view to committing offences which are punishable by deprivation of liberty … of a maximum of at least four years or a more serious penalty;

- whether such offences are an end in themselves or a means of obtaining material benefits and, where appropriate, of improperly influencing the operation of public authorities;

- the offences referred to in the first subparagraph include those mentioned in Article 2 of the Europol Convention and in the Annex thereto and carrying a sentence at least equivalent to that provided for in the first subparagraph.

2.2.2. The concept of prevention

Definition

There are numerous definitions of crime prevention. For the purposes of this communication, the Commission proposes the following definition:

---

2 A very similar definition is given in the future UN Convention against transnational organised crime:
(a) “Organized criminal group” shall mean a structured group of three or more persons, existing for a period of time and acting in concert with the aim of committing one or more serious crimes or offences established in accordance with this Convention, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit;
(b) “Serious crime” shall mean conduct constituting an offence punishable by a maximum deprivation of liberty of at least four years or a more serious penalty;
(c) “Structured group” shall mean a group that is not randomly formed for the immediate commission of an offence and that does not need to have formally defined roles for its members, continuity of its membership or a developed structure; …”.

Crime prevention includes all activities which contribute to halting or reducing crime as a social phenomenon, both quantitatively and qualitatively, either through permanent and structured cooperation measures or through ad hoc initiatives. These activities are undertaken by all the actors likely to play a preventive role: local representatives, enforcement services and the judicial system, social services, education system, associations in the broad sense, industry, banks and the private sector, research workers and scientists, and the general public, supported by the media.

Specialised studies distinguish various approaches to prevention focusing either on the victims or on the perpetrators of criminal or punishable conduct, or on persons or social groups at risk, or on risk situations.

Three categories of measures can thus be distinguished according to whether they are intended to:

- reduce opportunities, making crime more difficult and riskier and reducing the profits to criminals;
- reduce the social and economic factors which encourage the development of crime;
- provide information and protection for victims and prevent victimisation.

Convergence of national experience

Prevention as a complement to enforcement policy is a concept widely accepted in the Member States, and experiments conducted so far have yielded encouraging results. In the light of the current experiments, the Commission notes that there are constant factors in the strategies which, in general:

- develop a multi-disciplinary approach;
- articulate preventive action, security policies and flanking policies (police and judicial policies, social, educational and research policies, etc.);
- develop partnership between those involved in prevention on the ground that prevention works only if all the components of society are involved.

These principles, shared by all the Member States, make it possible already to speak of a “European model” of crime prevention.

3. ELEMENTS FOR A EUROPEAN STRATEGY

3.1. Justification in terms of subsidiarity

The Member States’ responsibilities are essential in crime prevention matters. They are exercised through the various national policies contributing to crime prevention, such as criminal law, social policy, education, town planning, taxation, etc. With regard to general crime, the tendency is moreover to develop preventive action as close as possible to the grass-roots level, as can be seen from the emergence of multiple local and contractual policies, “community policing” practices and local justice and police forces and the involvement of partners from different backgrounds.
Intervention by the European Union is likely to add real value to these policies.

For one thing, the problems of cross-border organised crime are recognised as a matter of common concern for the Member States, and Community instruments and instruments of judicial and police cooperation must be mobilised at the same time. For another, with regard to general crime, the Tampere European Council already identified a number of common features: this involves crime that is often urban and drug-related, in which juvenile delinquency is an major source of concern. Thorough analysis in all the Member States of the Union would probably make it possible to identify other constant factors.

In addition, prevention methods are also tending to converge, but without adequate knowledge beyond the local, regional or national level. Sharing experience and good practices, which has produced good results in other fields of justice and home affairs, would improve the treatment of these problems.

The European Union strategy should therefore operate on two levels:

It will initially be centred on national prevention policies. To achieve the objectives mentioned above, Member States will must undertake resolutely to intensify their efforts to prevent crime, both organised and general. To that end, they should adopt or strengthen national prevention strategies. The stock-taking of the policies followed by the Member States and the exchange of information and experience between them that began at the Praia da Falésia conference must be continued. This exercise will make it possible to decide what could usefully be done by the Union.

In the second place, these policies will be supplemented by action of the European Union, which, without replacing national, regional or local action, will supplement the pyramid of responsibilities and facilitate national action while highlighting topics of common interest.

3.2. Objectives

The Commission considers first of all that to be fully effective, the response to the challenge of crime must be comprehensive and be based on complementarity between enforcement and preventive instruments since rapid, well-adapted and proportionate penalties and effective monitoring of the implementation of penalties are in themselves dissuasive and therefore preventive. It is important for the Member States to provide for penalties for offences against Community legislation in appropriate cases.

Then, it must be stressed that prevention by definition concerns offences that have not been committed and calls for heightened vigilance, which could entail security measures that would impose excessive constraints on the citizen. Close attention must be paid to ensuring that the Union’s preventive action respects the fundamental principles of law and public freedoms.

Since the prevention strategy seeks to protect both the citizen and society, the European Union should set itself the following targets:

- To reduce opportunities for crime, so as to increase the risks that the criminal will be detected and punished and to reduce the possibilities of profiting from his crime;

- To reduce the factors which facilitate entry into the world of crime and repetition;
• To avoid victimisation, i.e. all those factors which, by placing a person in a situation of vulnerability, predispose him to being a victim of crime;

• To reduce the sense of insecurity;

• To promote and disseminate a law-abiding culture and a management culture designed to avert conflicts;

• To promote good governance and, in particular, to prevent corruption;

• To prevent criminal infiltration of the structures of the economy and society.

Since this is a new Union policy, the Commission considers that prioritisation is essential, proceeding from the guidelines laid down at the Tampere European Council and the Praia da Falésia conference. As regards general crime, attention must be devoted initially to urban, juvenile and drug-related crime. As regards organised crime, priority actions must aim at high-tech crime, drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, and in particular the exploitation of women, the sexual exploitation of children, financial crime and euro counterfeiting.

3.3. Principles

To achieve these objectives and in view of the thinking already under way, the Union strategy should focus on three points:

(1) **Knowledge**: to improve understanding of the phenomena of crime, stressing the identification of new trends, the study of the impact of preventive action and the evaluation and sharing of national experience and practices;

(2) **Partnership**: to develop cooperation and the networking of those involved in prevention at all levels – European, national and local. The accent should be at the same time on raising awareness of the prevention concept, the exchange of information, launching new projects and following them up, and disseminating the results;

(3) **Multi-disciplinary approach**: to promote the complementarity of instruments with a view to developing prevention techniques and methods, in particular reducing the opportunities for crime, and to launching projects.

As regards organised crime, given certain specific features of it and the specific requests made in the Council Resolution of December 1998, a complementary analysis carried out by the Commission and Europol will be presented later.

4. Instruments

To support the implementation of this strategy, the Commission proposes the following horizontal actions and instruments:
4.1. Developing crime prevention in the policies of the European Union

Many of the Union’s policies, although not expressly targeting crime prevention, contribute to it by promoting economic and social cohesion, growth and employment or a transparent economic environment.

The Council Resolution of December 1998 on the prevention of organised crime and the conclusions of the High-Level Conference of May 2000 on crime prevention, asked the Commission to evaluate existing Community policies and instruments in terms of their contribution to crime prevention. Following this examination, the Commission wishes to develop a more structured approach allowing systematic use of Community policies and instruments.

The following policies are specifically concerned:

- Regulation of economic and financial activity

Policies for the control or regulation of economic activities implemented at Community level, in particular within the framework of the internal market, contribute to preventing fraud, corruption and crime. What really matters here is the set of instruments aiming at transparency in public procurement, the prevention of the use of the financial system for money-laundering, fair trading, rules governing the liability of bodies corporate, checks on the movement of sensitive goods and transport, and communication and data-processing technologies.

The Commission has already made proposals on prevention of fraud in payment instruments,\(^4\) money-laundering,\(^5\) fraud in public procurement,\(^6\) counterfeiting and piracy.\(^7\) New proposals or additional studies will also be needed on other priority matters. The Joint Council meeting (ECOFIN and JHA) on 17 October gave the Commission a mandate to investigate the possibilities of increasing the consistency and the force of existing national provisions for the surveillance of cross-border cash movements. The Commission was also called on to identify measures that would help solve the difficulties, widely acknowledged on the international scene, of front companies and other opaque legal creatures in the fight against money-laundering.\(^8\)

- Social policy

The fight against social exclusion is a strategic objective set for the European Union by the Lisbon European Council of 23 and 24 March 2000. Since crime prevention fits into the European social model recognised in Lisbon, the programme against social exclusion should

\(^4\) The Commission is planning to adopt an action plan by the end of the year.

\(^5\) The proposal for amendment of the Directive of 10 July 1991 on prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money-laundering is in the process of being adopted.

\(^6\) In addition to a proposal for amendment of the Community rules governing public procurement now under discussion in the Council, the Commission has set up a working party to examine the advisability of additional measures such as the development of black lists and the exchange of information on tenderers.

\(^7\) An action plan will follow up the Green Paper on combating counterfeiting and piracy in the internal market, adopted on 15.10.1998.

\(^8\) The Council asked the Commission for a report on the question of establishing minimum transparency criteria for the various forms of body corporate (notably trusts and foundations) in order to provide means of identifying the economic beneficiaries more closely.
be more closely matched to the crime prevention strategy. The Commission’s adoption of a new social agenda, which stresses higher standards of living and a higher quality of life, might be an opportunity for action here, in particular for the prevention of drug-addiction.

The fight against racism and xenophobia, another main principle of the fight against discrimination, is also related to the aim of prevention. It calls for aid for the social, economic and cultural integration of immigrants, training, and in particular education in the multicultural society, and for a fight against all the forms of discrimination (in housing, employment, access to education etc.). The Commission programme includes an action plan to develop the exchange of information, experience and good practices.\(^9\)

- **Urban policy**

Like Parliament and the Committee of the Regions, the Commission emphasises the importance of the urban dimension in crime prevention policy. Under Article 4(1) and (7) of Regulation No 1260/1999 laying down general provisions concerning the Structural Funds the Commission, on a proposal from the Member State, may include urban areas in difficulty, in particular those with a high crime and delinquency rate, in the list of areas eligible for Objective 2. Measures relating to urban areas in difficulty could be incorporated in broader programmes implemented in Objective 1 and 2 regions, using multi-sectoral territorial policies.\(^10\) Lastly, the URBAN initiative financed by the ERDF, launched in 1994 and renewed in 1999, reflects this concern to promote local initiatives and actions, in particular in areas in difficulty in major conurbations.\(^11\) It could also provide a link between small-scale innovative approaches and the adoption of an integrated, participatory approach in the main Structural Fund programmes.

In the future, the accent should be on crime resulting from inadequate urban planning. In particular, the situation of insecurity and/or crime should be among the indicators of the urban audits regularly carried out in the large cities of the European Union.

- **Regional policy**

The Community supports economic and social cohesion initiatives which indirectly contribute to crime prevention. More directly the ERDF can already be made to contribute, via national programmes, to supporting initiatives to fight and prevent crime. The most significant example is the programme presented by Italy concerning security in the development of the Mezzogiorno in the context of the Objective 1 programme for 1994-99 and renewed for 2000-06. For the moment this is still a special case reflecting structural problems affecting the fabric of society and conditioning the region’s economic development.

---

\(^9\) The aim of this programme, which covers the period 2001-06, is directly related to the aim of prevention treated here and its discussion continues in the Council and Parliament.


\(^11\) The relevant urban areas, towns or districts, must meet at least three conditions, including a high rate of unemployment, a high rate of poverty and exclusion, a high number of immigrants, ethnic minorities or refugees, a low level of education, a high crime and delinquency rate and a particularly damaged environment.
In addition INTERREG, also financed by the ERDF, allows more targeted interventions on internal and external borders and cross-border areas in the Union, particularly in relation to urban development, social inclusion and judicial and administrative cooperation.

Even if the cohesion policy does not for the moment identify crime prevention as one of its objectives, it would not seem to rule out the inclusion of projects in this field, and in due course they could enter the mainstream of regional policy.

- Research policy

There are already specific research programmes on security of networks and the fight against computer crime. Within the framework of the European Research Area (2002–06), the Commission will examine the possibilities of using techniques, and in particular new technologies, for crime prevention in general.

Concerning economic and social research, the fifth Framework Research Programme\(^\text{12}\) makes it possible to study the causes of social problems, to ascertain the statistical reality and compare good practices. A Working Party has been set up to examine in their context the problems of school and urban violence, drug-addiction and more generally the sense of insecurity and the solutions found by the Member States. New initiatives could aim, for example, to study the factors of effectiveness of the prevention policies.

- The information society

The forthcoming Commission Communication on making the information society safer by combating computer crime will propose comprehensive action to make computer networks, including Internet, safer.

Among the Union’s priorities, the Commission wishes to see rapid implementation of the measures and recommendations in its Communication. To that end, the Commission will consult interested parties, industries, users and police authorities and evaluate the advisability of new legal instruments.

- External policy

The Community’s cooperation and assistance policies and programmes extensively incorporate the fight against crime already. The Commission suggests that the EC/EU pursue its action in the various international bodies concerned, notably the United Nations and the Council of Europe. It recalls that the Community has already declared its intention of acceding to the United Nations Convention against organised transnational crime and the two Protocols against trafficking in persons and the smuggling of migrants. The expertise accumulated by the OSCE, notably in terms of “new risks to security” and protecting the concept of the state based on the rule of law, must be brought into the equation.

The Commission considers that it would be worth developing cooperation with certain third countries via existing international networks and forums such as the International Crime Prevention Centre,\(^\text{13}\) whose expertise is generally acknowledged. Lastly, it will be necessary


\(^{13}\) The CIPC, set up to serve cities and countries seeking to reduce crime and insecurity, is made up of cities, national prevention organisations and institutes, and is supported by several Member States - France, Portugal, United Kingdom and the Netherlands.
to gradually associate the applicant countries with Union crime prevention activities. The PHARE programmes preparing the applicant countries for accession to the Union are already used to finance preventive action.\textsuperscript{14} The Commission intends to make full use of the possibilities for involving these countries in the various existing and future instruments and financial programmes, and in particular those proposed in this communication (financial programme, Forum for Prevention etc.).

\textbf{Environment policy:}

The various ad hoc initiatives and measures taken in performance of obligations imposed by international or Community environment legislation already help in the fight against environmental crime (including illegal trade in species of fauna and flora threatened with extinction and products derived from them; the illegal discharge and transfer of radioactive waste and substances; illegal pollution and the disposal and storage of waste, including the transfer of hazardous waste entering and leaving the Union; and illegal trade in substances which deplete the ozone layer). But the implementation of these initiatives and measures would be facilitated if there were greater cooperation and exchange of information and experience between the various actors. And environmental crime transcends the Community’s borders – this is a truly global phenomenon, where prevention should entail a dimension of cooperation with applicant and third countries.

As all these examples show, the existing Community policies and instruments already give numerous possibilities of action. To put them more at the service of prevention, the Commission will endeavour to create greater consistency between the crime prevention elements already present in these policies and instruments.

\textbf{4.2. Testing legislative proposals: crime proofing}

This topic was broached both in the Tampere conclusions and in the conclusions of the Praia da Falésia Conference. The concept remains to be specified,\textsuperscript{15} in particular in relation to fraud proofing,\textsuperscript{16} but it can nevertheless be defined as the evaluation of existing or planned legislative instruments against the yardstick of crime-proofing.

This evaluation would be made when any new legislation or decision is drafted, both in the European Union and in the Member States. It is at that point that the opportunities for crime that the proposal might offer need to be identified.

The Commission will be at pains to evaluate the possible impact of its legislative proposals in terms of opportunities for crime, particularly in sensitive areas. Preparations for the introduction of the euro are an example of forward planning taking into consideration the risks that might flow from the single currency. The ideal time for the evaluation is not only

\textsuperscript{14} An example is the PHARE multi-beneficiary programme against drugs, the PHARE programme of cross-border cooperation and the customs modernisation programme.

\textsuperscript{15} A study on this topic, financed by the Falcone Programme, will produce its first results at the end of 2000.

\textsuperscript{16} With regard to the prevention of fraud against the Community budget, the Commission (OLAF) communication from 28\textsuperscript{th} June indicated the intention of establishing an instrument to evaluate the quality of legislation. This instrument will “ensure that the Office may be consulted at the stage of preparation and at the various stages in the decision making process of all the legislative initiatives which have a direct or indirect impact on the protection of the Community’s financial interests to ensure a better proofing against fraud and corruption”. (COM 2000 (358), p.7)
the inter-departmental consultation stage but also the actual drafting stage, and even the publication of initial consultation documents (Communication, Green or White Paper).

There should also be a similar evaluation when the Member States take initiatives for the preparation of national legislation, including subordinate legislation.

But the risks of criminal action are not confined to new instruments alone. Existing legislation should also be evaluated, both Community instruments and international instruments to which the Community accedes. It would be unrealistic to propose full screening of all this legislation, but it would be conceivable to run a risk analysis on major areas of legislation so as to identify areas that are less crime-proof and make recommendations to eliminate the loopholes. The Commission could contemplate this evaluation when reports on the implementation of Community legislation are prepared, so that it can make any necessary crime-proofing proposals or additional proposals, in particular in police and judicial matters.

Whether this evaluation is *ex ante* or *ex post*, it presupposes a reinforcement of the Commission’s internal consultation and analysis mechanisms. A serious examination should involve specialists and experts, in particular those of the police and judicial authorities. This is a field where information exchanges between experts and centres of excellence should be developed.

### 4.3. Improving knowledge of the phenomena of crime

#### Comparability of data

The Action Plan to combat organised crime adopted by the Amsterdam European Council in June 1997 recognised the usefulness of data collected and analysed on a European scale. The Member States and the Commission were invited to establish or identify, “*set up or identify a mechanism for the collection and analysis of data which is so construed that it can provide a picture of the organised crime situation in the Member State and which can assist law enforcement authorities in fighting organised crime*” (Recommendation 2). The Action Plan also specified the conditions for working towards this objective and called on the Member States to use “*common standards*” for data gathering and analysis. Europol and the Member States followed this up when drawing up the annual Report on the situation of organised crime in the European Union.

As regards general crime, the absence of reliable and comparable data on phenomena in Europe is an obstacle to the comparison of national policies for combating and preventing crime. Yet such a comparison, while having its limits, is an important means of validating policies and evaluating practices, as was underlined at various seminars.

Given the proximity or similarity of certain situations in the Member States, despite legal differences that remain substantial, and the increasing convergence of national policies, an effort must be made in the Union to improve the comparability of quantitative and qualitative data. The Council of Europe is working on the matter, as is the United Nations, in particular regarding data on general crime.

Since there is a considerable variety of users and of needs, and these needs are bound to develop with the implementation of the Amsterdam Treaty, the efforts to be made must be multidisciplinary but also involve the various actors such as the Commission (in particular the Statistical Office), Europol and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, to avoid duplications and promote better complementarity of efforts and results.
Some initiatives are already under way. In the field of drugs, the Action Plan of the European Union (2000-04) also calls on the Council and the Commission, on the basis of work done by Europol and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, to produce a common definition of the concept of “drug-related crime” to underlie an objective comparison between the numbers of drug-related offences. In the field of racism and xenophobia, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia is also working on statistics.

**Indicators**

Providing objective and relevant indicators is an essential dimension of a strategy which claims to be based on better knowledge of the phenomena of crime. In terms of a partnership strategy, they must be such as to be useful both to official authorities and to groups and entities that are vulnerable to crime.

The studies and seminars carried out until now have shown the contribution of cross-referring data from different origins, both for understanding these phenomena and for updating in the light of new trends in crime. Here, supplementing traditional information sources with information from, in particular, private-sector sources, would undeniably provide added value.

The development of a prevention strategy close to the people also demands analysis of the sense of insecurity and its pattern. Among the studies to be carried out on this topic, public opinion surveys are a valuable source of information. A Eurobarometer on the perception of security among Europe’s citizens was conducted in 1996. The Commission intends to carry out such surveys from time to time.

**Evaluating practices**

Sharing experience and good practice presupposes evaluating them first of all, according to common criteria, in order to determine if and in what conditions they can be taken over or generalised.

As regards prevention of organised crime, a study is in hand covering the principal criteria and procedures which might be followed to facilitate this. The aim is to propose a technique for evaluating national practices highlighting the conditions in which this experience was gained and the elements which could be reproduced.

The conclusions of this study will be helpful for the analysis of good practices in the prevention of general crime. The work done during the German Presidency for the development of a European manual of good practices must also be taken into account.

**4.4. Networking those involved in prevention**

**Establishing a European Forum for the prevention of organised crime**

The approach proposed in this Communication is largely based on the mobilisation and networking of those involved in prevention, whether of “petty crime” or of transnational crime.

There are many topics to be treated, the nature of the information exchanged is not the same, and the same experts cannot deal indiscriminately with questions ranging from social mediation to cybercrime. In the field of petty crime, it is more especially the social partners...
who must be associated with the efforts of the official authorities, whereas in the field of economic and financial crime, and *a fortiori* of organised crime, business and professional circles must be involved in prevention.

The Commission supports the initiative taken by the French Presidency and Sweden proposing the creation of a European network of prevention focusing on urban, juvenile and drug-related crime. Meeting one of the priorities set by the Tampere European Council, the adoption of this network will be a component of the implementation of this strategy and will need to mesh with the other proposals made in this strategy.

Concerning organised crime, the Commission notes that raising the awareness of business and financial circles and certain professions particularly exposed to the risks of corruption or implication in money-laundering and fraud operations of the dangers and costs of crime is at its beginnings. Initiatives such as the round table of European industrialists on questions of security and crime prevention and the European Charter on vulnerable professions signed on 27 July 1999 should be encouraged and extended at Union level.

An initiative therefore appears necessary. The Commission is accordingly proposing that a European Forum for the prevention of organised crime be established. Affecting an extremely wide range of fields, lawful and unlawful dealings in goods, cybercrime, corruption, financial crime, environmental crime and the role of certain key professions, the prevention of organised crime and economic crime requires the Forum to meet in a variety of formations, depending on the topics treated, and to set up specialised working groups.

Representatives of the European institutions and bodies working on prevention, national coordination bodies, relevant public services and in particular the judicial and police authorities, local and regional authorities, business and financial circles are the most likely to be involved in the Forum. Moreover, relevant associations and occupational circles – the professions, the media and security organisations – must be involved, depending on the topics treated.

The purpose of the European Forum for the prevention of organised crime is to widen the debate on prevention to all those involved, to prompt pilot initiatives and projects with a European dimension and thus cause projects to emerge that meet the conditions laid down in the financial programme. These projects will include the setting up of the tools and instruments specified in the joint analysis by Europol and the Commission.

*The role of the Forum*

The European Forum for the prevention of organised is a Commission initiative that seeks first and foremost to structure prevention work at European level. It provides a framework for networking experts and launching initiatives. But as the Forum aims to promote and coordinate dialogue on prevention at European level, national coordination structures should be set up, where they do not already exist, both in the public services and in civil society. The scope and effectiveness of the dialogue started at European level will depend mainly on the relay facilities that these structures can provide.
The European Forum for the prevention of organised crime should also interact with other existing discussion forums and working groups in specific sectors, both European and international, and provide input for their activities.

The Forum will have to:

- be available to the European institutions and the Member States, to assist them on the questions concerning the prevention of this type of crime;
- contribute to identifying new crime trends;
- facilitate the exchange of information on preventive action;
- contribute to the setting up and operation of the expertise centres (centres of excellence, networks, data banks) on specific topics;
- contribute to identifying fields of research, training and evaluation.

The Commission wishes to design the Forum in such a way that it can be managed by a lightweight structure that can be supplied by its own departments.

**Dissemination of information**

The Commission will examine with the partners concerned the need to set up a web site on prevention to facilitate access to information on European and national policies and practices and allow the exchange of information in connection with the work of the European prevention networks.

**4.5. Establishing a financial instrument**

The Tampere European Council suggested that consideration should be given to European Union financial support for the crime prevention strategy. The Commission has come to the conclusion that a financial instrument would add value to the action of the Member States, as it announced at Praia da Falésia.

The aim of the instrument will be to encourage the implementation of the strategy set out in this communication. It is clear from points 41 and 42 of the Tampere conclusions that it must extend to all forms of crime and support the actions mentioned in this communication in accordance with priorities to be determined. The definition of these priorities will also take account of the actions proposed by the joint Commission and Europol working paper on the prevention of organised crime.

European intervention will take the form of an ad hoc financial instrument. Projects would be open to the applicant countries, under the same conditions as for the latter.

Whatever formula is selected, the financial instrument should comprise two aspects, one devoted to cross-border organised crime and the other to general crime.

---

17 Thus, for example, in relation to the protection of the environment, the work of the IMPEL network, or in relation to the fight against fraud and the protection of the Community's financial interests, the work of COCOLAF
The projects to be supported by the financial instrument, fed by the European Network for crime prevention and the European Forum for the prevention of organised crime, could thus be as follows:

- **Meetings and seminars**

- **Studies and research**: this would involve progressing towards better knowledge of the phenomenon (cf. the practice of “problem-oriented policing” or the concept of “knowledge-based crime prevention”);

- **Pilot projects**: the financial instrument could contribute financially to innovative projects with a European dimension (e.g. centres of excellence, data banks);

- **Exchange of good practices**

As in the case of other Title VI projects, the financial instrument would be managed by the Commission, assisted by a management committee consisting of representatives of the Member States. It would determine the annual priorities of the financial instrument and take decisions on Commission proposals for the use of appropriations. Projects could be financed up to 70%, which would make it possible to support projects emanating from non-governmental partners.

The financial instrument would be regarded as a pilot operation, and would be established by decision under Article 34 of the Treaty on European Union for an initial two-year period (2001-02). With regard to financial amounts, there should be a cautious start. An annual budget of €1 million appears reasonable, pending the Commission’s general proposals on the programmes that it manages.

Lastly, the first priorities could be defined in 2001. The conference to be organised under the Swedish Presidency in February 2001 could be a useful opportunity to define a first set of practical priorities and to facilitate the launch of the financial instrument as soon as the corresponding decision is taken.

5. **CONCLUSION**

The Commission asks the European Parliament, the Council, the Committee of the Regions and the Economic and Social Committee to examine this communication and make their views known on the crime prevention strategy proposed in it.

Having regard to the suggested approach, based on the association of all those involved in prevention in the definition of new projects, the Commission also asks the relevant professional and other associations and organisations representing industry and services, and any organisation or association representing civil society which may be concerned, to take note of this communication and make their views known.
EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

1. INTRODUCTION

On 1 May 1999 the Amsterdam Treaty entered into force and introduced the objective of an area of freedom, security and justice. The conclusions of the Tampere European Council on 15-16 October 1999 then fleshed this concept out in a number of respects, including the prevention of crime of all kinds, whether or not organised. Points 41 and 42 of the conclusions state:

‘41. The European Council calls for the integration of crime prevention aspects into actions against crime as well as for the further development of national crime prevention programmes. Common priorities should be developed and identified in crime prevention in the external and internal policy of the Union and be taken into account when preparing new legislation.

42. The exchange of best practices should be developed, the network of competent national authorities for crime prevention and cooperation between national crime prevention organisations should be strengthened and the possibility of a Community funded programme should be explored for these purposes. The first priorities for this cooperation could be juvenile, urban and drug-related crime.’

On this basis, the Commission has presented a communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the Committee of the Regions and the Economic and Social Committee on the prevention of crime in the European Union. It confirmed the value of equipping the Union with a new programme to encourage cooperation between all the public and private organisations involved in preventing crime of all kinds, whether organised or more general, as recommended by point 42 of the Tampere conclusions.

To stay in line with the other programmes managed by the Commission and raise this new programme’s profile, it is proposed that it be named for Hippocrates, the legendary founder of medicine whose motto was: ‘Prevention is better than cure’.

Establishing this programme is compatible with the Commission’s longer-term intentions, as it is currently reviewing all the programmes managed under Title VI of the Treaty on European Union in order to improve their conformity with the Union’s political work programme on justice and home affairs and to reflect new guidelines to simplify financial management within broader-based instruments.

2. THE DRAFT DECISION

The proposal for a Council Decision establishing the Hippocrates Programme proceeds from the Commission’s experience in managing comparable justice and home affairs programmes such as Oisin, Falcone, Stop and Grotius. The draft decision is based on the three drafts currently under discussion for new legal bases for the three programmes that come to an end at the end of the year. The harmonised drafting of all these legal bases will help to make them easier to read and is a potential precursor to comprehensive recasting of these financial instruments. The draft decision on the Hippocrates Programme provides for the same expiry date as the other programmes managed by the Commission, 31 December 2002.

The proposed structure reflects that of the other justice and home affairs programmes managed by the Commission and presented to the Council for renewal. The decision focuses...
on the provisions that are indispensable for the establishment of the programme, leaving
annual priorities and measures to be undertaken to be settled by annual work programmes.

Pursuant to the Interinstitutional Agreement of 6 May 1999 (point 54), the financial reference
amount is not provided for by the draft decision. The Commission nevertheless proposes that
it be set at €2 million. This seems an appropriate amount for a start-up phase of action based
on a new European Union policy. The programme’s financial impact should be limited at the
first stage so that its utility can be evaluated before there is a proposal to renew or extend it.

As in the case of the other programmes, the Commission is proposing that co-financing be
limited to 70% for projects presented by the Member States so as to allow project organisers
to make a proper evaluation of costs and avoid all risk of under-utilisation of funds. But it
proposes that the programme also be able to finance specific projects and complementary
measures that are conducive to its objectives, this time at 100%.

The programme’s objectives are deliberately presented in general terms in the draft decision,
partly because reactions to the Commission communication are not yet known and partly
because the financial instrument will be implemented substantially on the basis of priorities
set out in the annual work programmes, themselves dependent on the general policy priorities
in the scoreboard.

The programme management rules are taken over from the other justice and home affairs
programmes. As in the case of those programmes, the Commission will be assisted by a
Committee. The procedures are based on those provided for the Council Decision of 28 June
1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the
Commission. In practice, the application of these advisory or management procedures,
although automatically applicable only to first-pillar instruments, are ideal for the
management of third-pillar programmes. The management procedure will accordingly apply
for the adoption of the annual work programme and possible specific actions, whereas the
advisory procedure will apply for the approval of projects presented by organisers and
complementary measures.

3. ANALYSE ARTICLE BY ARTICLE

Article 1

Article 1 establishes the Hippocrates programme for a two-year period running from
1 January 2001.

Article 2

Article 2 sets the programme’s general objectives within the context of the general objective
set by Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union. The programme is to encourage
cooperation between all the public and private organisations involved in preventing crime of
all kinds, whether organised or not. It also provides for association of the States applying for
accession in projects supported by the programme.

Article 3

Article 3 describes the organisations eligible for financing under the programme, and the
conditions for admissibility of projects in terms of their European dimension, notably as
regards the minimum number of Member States involved in organising projects. It also
provides that the programme may finance specific projects or complementary measures that are conducive to its objectives.

Article 4

Article 4 specifies the types of project that may be co-financed under the programme.

Article 5

Article 5 specifies the general rules for financial management and the rules applicable to project financing.

Article 6

Article 6 governs the implementation of the programme, in cooperation with the Member States. Paragraph 3 sets out the implementing measures to be prepared by the Commission, and paragraph 4 states how these are to be considered by the programme committee. It also specifies the procedure applying to each major category of implementing measures. Paragraph 5 lays down general criteria for evaluating and selecting projects, so that potential organisers can be guided by them when preparing their projects. These criteria will be the basis for Commission proposals to approve or reject projects.

Article 7

Article 7 provides that the Commission will be assisted in the management of the programme by a committee consisting of one representative from each Member State. It specifies that representatives of the applicant countries may be invited to briefing sessions after the committee’s meetings.

Article 8

Article 8 refers to the advisory procedure laid down by Decision 1999/468/EC.

Article 9

Article 9 refers to the management procedure laid down by Decision 1999/468/EC.

Article 10

Article 10 requires the Commission to undertake each year an evaluation of the actions carried out in implementing the programme and to report each year to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of the programme.

Article 11

Article 11 provides that the programme is to enter into force on the day of publication of the Decision in the Official Journal.
Proposal for a

COUNCIL DECISION

establishing a programme of incentives and exchanges, training and cooperation for the prevention of crime (Hippocrates)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Having regard to the Treaty on European Union, and in particular Article 34(2)(c) thereof,

Having regard to the Commission initiative of ... 2000,

Having regard to the Opinion of the European Parliament,

Whereas:

(1) Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union states that the Union's objective is to provide citizens with a high level of safety within an area of freedom, security and justice by developing common action among the Member States, in particular in the field of prevention of crime, whether or not organised.

(2) The conclusions of the Tampere European Council call for cooperation in the fight against crime to be stepped up and for the possibility of establishing a programme financed by the Community to support this cooperation to be studied.

(3) Experience gained in managing the other intervention programmes financed by the Community, such as Oisin and Falcone, confirms the value of a similar instrument for crime prevention, to be charged to the budget of the European Communities.

(4) The optimum effectiveness of the intervention of the European Union will be ensured if it extends to all forms of crime, whether or not organised.

(5) The complexity of the phenomenon of crime in the Member States and the diversity of prevention policies already implemented by the Member States create a need for multidisciplinary approaches based on familiarity with crime.

(6) This programme, like the other programmes for cooperation in justice and home affairs, is open to the applicant countries with a view to facilitating their participation in the projects supported by the programme.

(7) In accordance with Article 2 of Council Decision 1999/468/EC of 28 June 1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission,¹⁸ the measures needed for the implementation of this Decision specified

in Article 3(1) and the second subparagraph of Article 3(4) should be adopted by the advisory procedure laid down by Article 3 of Decision 1999/468/EC.

(8) The measures needed for the implementation of this Decision specified in the first subparagraph of Article 3(4) and the first indent of Article 6(3) being management measures within the meaning of Article 2 of Decision 1999/468/EC of 28 June 1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission, they should be taken by the management procedure laid down by Article 4 of Decision 1999/468/EC.

HAS ADOPTED THIS DECISION:

Article 1

Establishment of the programme

1. This decision establishes a programme of cooperation in the prevention of crime, to be known as “Hippocrates”.

2. The programme is established for a period of two years running from 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2002.

Article 2

Programme objectives

1. The programme shall contribute to the general objective of providing citizens with a high level of protection in an area of freedom, security and justice. Within this framework, it is intended to encourage cooperation between all the public and private organisations in the Member States involved in the prevention of crime, whether or not organised.

2. The applicant countries may participate in projects in order to familiarise themselves with the Union acquis in this area and help them prepare for accession. Other third countries may also participate where this serves the aims of the projects.

Article 3

Access to the programme

1. The programme shall co-finance projects submitted by public or private organisations in the European Union involved in the prevention of crime.

2. To be eligible for co-financing, the projects must involve at least three Member States, or two Member States and one applicant country, and have the objectives mentioned in Article 2.

3. The programme may also finance:

– specific projects of particular interest in terms of the programme's priorities or cooperation with the applicant countries;

– complementary measures such as seminars, meetings of experts or other activities to disseminate the information obtained under the programme.

Article 4

Activities of the programme

The programme shall comprise the following types of project:

– Training;
– Exchanges and placements;
– Studies and research;
– Meetings and seminars;
– Dissemination of the results obtained within the framework of the programme.

Article 5

Financing the programme

1. The annual appropriations shall be authorised by the budgetary authority within the limits of the financial perspective.

2. The co-financing of a project by the programme shall be exclusive of any other financing by another programme financed by the budget of the European Communities.

3. Financing decisions shall be followed by grant contracts between the Commission and the organisers. The financing decisions and contracts arising therefrom shall be subject to financial control by the Commission and to audits by the Court of Auditors.

4. The proportion of financial support from the Community budget shall not exceed 70% of the cost of the project.

5. However, the specific projects and complementary measures mentioned in Article 3(4) can be financed to 100%, up to a ceiling of 10% of the total financial package allocated annually to the programme for each of the two categories.

Article 6

Implementation of the programme

1. The Commission shall be responsible for the management and implementation of the programme, in cooperation with the Member States.
2. The programme shall be managed by the Commission in accordance with the Financial Regulation of 21 December 1977 applicable to the general budget of the European Communities.

3. To implement the programme, the Commission shall:
   - prepare an annual work programme comprising specific objectives, thematic priorities and, if necessary, a list of specific projects and supplementary measures;
   - evaluate and select the projects presented by the organisers mentioned in Article 3.

4. The Commission shall submit to the Committee mentioned in Article 7 the draft measures to be taken to implement the project. Examination of the drafts presented by the organisers and of the supplementary measures shall be carried out in accordance with the advisory procedure mentioned in Article 8. Examination of the annual work programme and the specific projects shall be carried out in accordance with the management procedure mentioned in Article 9.

5. The Commission shall evaluate and select projects submitted for financing under the programme on the basis of the following criteria:
   - Conformity with the programme's objectives;
   - Whether the project has a European dimension and is open to participation by the applicant countries;
   - Compatibility with the work undertaken or planned within the framework of the European Union's political priorities on crime prevention;
   - Complementarity with other past, present or future cooperation projects;
   - Ability of the organiser to implement the project;
   - The inherent quality of the project in terms of its conception, organisation, presentation and expected results;
   - The amount of the subsidy requested under the programme and whether it is proportionate with the expected results;
   - The impact of the expected results on the programme's objectives.

Article 7

Committee

1. The Commission shall be assisted by a Committee to be known as the “Hippocrates Committee”, composed of the representatives of the Member States and chaired by a representative of the Commission.

2. The Committee shall adopt its rules of procedure on a proposal by the chair.
3. The Commission may invite representatives from the applicant countries to briefing sessions after the Committee's meetings.

Article 8

Advisory procedure

Where this Article is referred to, the advisory procedure laid down by Article 3 of Decision 1999/468/EC shall apply, subject to compliance with Article 7(3) of that Decision.

Article 9

Management procedure

1. Where this Article is referred to, the advisory procedure laid down by Article 4 of Decision 1999/468/EC shall apply, subject to compliance with Article 7(3) of that Decision.

2. The period referred to in Article 4(3) of Decision 1999/468/EC shall be three months.

Article 10

Evaluation

1. The Commission shall undertake each year an evaluation of the actions carried out in implementing the programme for the previous year.

2. Each year the Commission shall report to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of the programme. The first report shall be presented before 31 July 2002.

Article 11

Entry into force

This Decision shall enter into force on the day of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

This Decision is addressed to the Member States.

Done at Brussels,
FINANCIAL STATEMENT

1. **TITLE OF OPERATION**

Proposal for a Council Decision establishing a programme of incentives and exchanges, training and cooperation for the prevention of crime (Hippocrates)

2. **BUDGET HEADING(S) INVOLVED**

B5-820

3. **LEGAL BASIS**

Article 34 TEU

4. **DESCRIPTION OF OPERATION**

4.1 **General objective**

The aim of the operation is to support the European crime-prevention strategy established as an objective of the European Union by Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union. It is one of the means of achieving an area of freedom, security and justice in the Union via closer and more effective cooperation in crime prevention. It follows up points 41 and 42 of the conclusions of the Tampere European Council of 15-16 October 1999, which call for closer cooperation in this area and for study of the possibility of a programme financed by the Community.

The Commission has also presented a general communication, concluding among other things that it was necessary to establish a financial instrument to support the European strategy it proposed.

The purpose of this instrument, known as the “Hippocrates Programme”, is to encourage cooperation between all the public and private organisations in the Member States involved in preventing crime of all kinds, whether organised or not. The programme is widely accessible to all partners concerned on a multidisciplinary basis.

The programme is to co-finance training, programmes of exchanges and placements, the organisation of meetings and seminars, studies and research and the dissemination of the results obtained under the programme.

4.2 **Period covered and arrangements for renewal**

The programme is envisaged for a period of two years (2001-02). This is in order to study the feasibility of merging the existing programmes (Grotius, Oisin and Stop) into a single programme governed by Title VI of the EU Treaty, into which Hippocrates will then also be incorporated.
5. CLASSIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE OR REVENUE

5.1 Non-compulsory expenditure

5.2 Differentiated appropriations

5.3 EXPENDITURE: €2 million

6. TYPE OF EXPENDITURE OR REVENUE

- subsidy for co-financing with other public or private sector sources for projects up to 70% of the cost of the project.

- 100% subsidy for specific projects on priority aspects of European interest and for supplementary measures, up to a limit of 10% of the annual budget for each of the two categories.

7. FINANCIAL IMPACT

7.1 Method of calculating total cost of operation (relation between individual and total costs)

The amount foreseen for the implementation of the programme for the period 2001 to 2002 is €2 million.

It corresponds to an estimate of the appropriations needed to launch a new project which in the first two years is inevitably a pilot programme. This estimate is based on the proportion of crime-prevention projects supported in the last two years under existing programmes (mainly Oisin and Falcone). The proportion, of between 20% and 25%, when related to the annual amount devoted to those two programmes (€5 million), prompts an estimate of an annual €1 million for the Hippocrates programme.

7.2 Itemised breakdown of cost

The itemised breakdown will depend on the projects presented by the Member States. The programme will be managed through annual work programmes which will seek to focus on the need for balance between seminars and conferences on the one hand and exchanges, studies and research on the other, in accordance with the conclusions from the other programmes managed by DG JAI in 1999/2000. It will also be desirable to put the accent on studies and research in an area where the acquisition of knowledge of the phenomena of crime is essential for the implementation of the Community strategy. The breakdown for 2001-02 could accordingly be as follows:
### Commitment appropriations EUR million (at current prices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
<th>Year 2002</th>
<th>n+2</th>
<th>n+3</th>
<th>n+4</th>
<th>n+5 and subs. years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, conferences, training meetings</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange and work experience programmes</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and research</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3 Operational expenditure for studies, experts etc. included in Part B of the budget

Not applicable.
7.4 Schedule of commitment and payment appropriations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment appropriations</th>
<th>Year 2001</th>
<th>Year 2002</th>
<th>n+2</th>
<th>n+3</th>
<th>n+4</th>
<th>n+5 and subs. years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment appropriations</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment appropriations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Fraud prevention measures

The general anti-fraud provisions apply. In addition, on-the-spot sampling checks are planned.

9. Elements of cost-effectiveness analysis

9.1 Specific and quantified objectives; target population

- **Specific objectives**: beyond the general objective of promoting cooperation in crime prevention, the Hippocrates programme will operate with annual work programmes setting priorities linked as closely as possible to the scoreboard for the review of progress in the creation of an area of freedom, security and justice in the European Union (Commission Communication to the Council and the European Parliament). Without prejudging the first work programme, to be decided on by the programme management committee, the following are probable avenues to be explored:

  - Increasing familiarity with the phenomena of crime in the Member States, both organised crime and crime more generally;
  
  - Promoting common prevention practices in the Member States;
  
  - Establishing working relations and mutual trust between prevention services on a multidisciplinary basis;
– Encouraging discussions on the improvement of cooperation and on experimental working methods;

– Comparing crime trends and the effectiveness of prevention methods;

– Disseminating information on the results of projects at European level.

– **Target population**: all the public and private organisations in the Member States involved in preventing crime, with the possibility of associating partners in the applicant countries and services or experts in other Member States whose participation is necessary for the implementation of the programme. For seminars and conferences, the final beneficiary is generally an organisation in a Union Member State or, in exceptional cases, a public organisation in an applicant country, in association with organisers in two Member States. For studies and research, the final beneficiary may be a public or private establishment or even an independent expert. In this event, the procedures applicable to public procurement will determine the recipient of financing.

9.2 **Grounds for the operation**

– **Need for Community budgetary intervention, particularly in view of the subsidiarity principle**: contribute to the attainment of the objectives set by the Amsterdam Treaty and the Tampere European Council regarding crime prevention, promote the development of professional relationships between organisations in the Member States on a multidisciplinary basis, facilitate networking of promoters, ensure transnationality and disseminate the results at European level.

– **Choice of ways and means**

  * *advantages compared with the alternative measures (comparative advantages)*: Europe-wide dissemination of results, response at European level to the needs of operators, greater coordination between the target populations.

  * *analysis of similar projects that may have been carried out at Community or national level*: at Community level there are no other specific projects; at national level projects are limited, so that it is not possible to set up a network and disseminate good practice throughout the European area.

  * *expected secondary and multiplier effects*: synergy and added value at European level.

– **Main factors of uncertainty which could affect the specific results of the operation**. Experience with earlier projects proves that there are none. On the contrary, there has been growing demand from the Member States for several years, highlighted at seminars organised with support from the European Union (e.g. the ministerial conference on prevention questions organised under the Portuguese Presidency in May 2000), and an increased sensitivity at European level to this type of action with a view to creating an area of freedom, security and justice in Europe.
9.3 Monitoring and evaluation of the operation

- Performance indicators

* output indicators (measuring activities used): analysis and dissemination of the results of the projects; creation of transnational partnerships;

* impact indicators (measuring performance against objectives): improved knowledge of the phenomena of crime (number of studies and research projects, and quality both in absolute terms and in terms of the programme’s objectives), increased number of practical forms of cooperation (number of training sessions, exchanges, conferences and seminars), effective dissemination of the results of projects financed by the programme;

- Details and frequency of planned evaluation: annual comprehensive internal evaluation; comprehensive external evaluation;

- Assessment of the results obtained (where the operation is to be continued or renewed). Independent favourable internal and external evaluation, results in line with the objectives, need to continue the activities undertaken, increasing demand from the promoters.

10. Administrative expenditure (Section III, Part A of the Budget)

The necessary human and administrative resources are to be covered from within the managing DG’s allocation.

10.1 Effect on the number of posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of post</th>
<th>Staff to be assigned to managing the operation</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent posts</td>
<td>Temporary posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using existing resources in the DG or department concerned</td>
<td>Drawing on additional resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials or temporary staff</td>
<td>A 0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional resources, indicate at what rate they would need to be made available.
### 10.2 Overall financial impact of additional human resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Method of calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resources (indicate budget heading)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amounts are the total cost of additional posts for the entire duration of the operation, if this duration is predetermined, or for 12 months if it is indefinite.

### 10.3 Increase in other administrative expenditure as a result of the operation, especially costs relating to meetings of committees and groups of experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget heading (number and heading)</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Method of calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A0 7031</td>
<td>48 000</td>
<td>15 experts x 2 Committee meetings x 800 x 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amounts are the total cost of the operation for the entire duration of the operation, if this duration is predetermined, or for 12 months if it is indefinite.