COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES



Brussels, SEC(2007) 1427

AVIS DU COMITE DES EVALUATIONS D'IMPACT

Proposal for a

COUNCIL FRAMEWORK DECISION

amending Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism

[COM(2007) 650 final] [SEC(2007) 1424] [SEC(2007) 1425]



Brussels, **20** JUIL 2007 D(2007) **6001**

Opinion

TitleImpact Assessment on Proposal for a revision of the
Council Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on
combating terrorism (Draft of 27 June 2007)

Lead DG DG JLS

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

As a follow up to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism of 2005, currently under ratification in Member States, this initiative proposes the revision of the Framework Decision of 13 June 2002 on combating terrorism in view of including explicit provisions on public incitement to commit a terrorist offence, recruitment for terrorism and training for terrorism comparable with the use of internet. Such provisions have the specific aim of harmonisation of relevant legislation also at the EU level.

(B) Positive aspects

The assessment of impacts is proportionate and the analysis of impacts on security and on human rights is particularly appropriate, given the nature of the proposal. Results from the stakeholder consultation are well reflected in the report.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted to the author DG.

General recommendations: The IA report needs to clarify and analyse the problem definition and the objectives, and to better demonstrate the value added of the initiative, in particular vis-à-vis implementation of the Council of Europe Convention. Also the expected benefits with respect to achieving the ultimate goal should be better analysed and quantified. These recommendations were generally accepted by JLS in the meeting.

(1) The IA needs to develop further the problem definition and explain with examples why current and planned actions by the Member States are not sufficient. Gaps and differences in Member States' current legislation, in particular regarding

E-mail: impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11. Office: BERL 6/29. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 2981898. Fax: (32-2) 2965960.

penalties and jurisdiction, terminology and scope of application (e.g. direct versus indirect propaganda) need to be further analysed. This analysis would then allow bringing out more clearly, in the impact analysis, the value added of proposed action such as co-financing to enhance capacity and expertise.

(2) The value added of a new EU initiative vis-à-vis the Convention of Council of Europe needs to be better demonstrated. The outlook (MS by MS) regarding ratification of the Convention needs to be added. The IA should explain whether slow ratification reflects underlying issues that might affect also the implementation of the new initiative. The impact of the new initiative on the EU position vis-à-vis third countries needs to be analysed.

(3) The objectives of the proposal need to be clarified. There appear to be two main objectives: enable easier tracking down of terrorists and limiting the terrorism propaganda. At least in a short term these might be conflicting (closing down websites versus monitoring them) and the IA report needs to clarify the relation between these objectives. The IA also has to clearly show to what extent (preferably in a quantified manner) the initiative contributes to achieving these twin objectives.

(4) Additional elements need to be brought forward under the social impacts. The IA report rightly analyses impact on fundamental rights, such as freedom of expression. This should be complemented by taking into account also increased protection of citizens and positive indirect impacts on other human rights and fundamental freedoms such as right to life, right to respect for physical and mental integrity, right to security, etc.

(5) The reasoning for discarding Option 2 could be developed further as this seems to have been the option that would best deliver on the dissemination objective. The IA report needs to expand discussion on (cost-) efficiency of this option, advantages and disadvantages of using currently available technologies (e.g. dynamic filtering or black list systems) and their potential future development. The IA report could also assess possibility of EU support for their development. Moreover, it should be clarified to which extent option 3 is intended as contributing to the effectiveness of option 2 and on that account would not be a stand-alone option.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2006/JLS/013 Strategic initiative
Author DG	DG JLS - JLS.D.1
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	18 July 2007
Date of adoption of Opinion	20 July 2007