

The ENPE/EUFJE work on prosecution and sanctioning practice (EU LIFE project)

**Dr. Carole M. Billiet, chair WG *Sanctioning:
prosecution and judicial practice*
Oxford 20-21 September 2017, EU
Environmental Crime Enforcement Networks
Conference 2017**

LIFE14 GIE/UK/000043



1. The 4th Working Group (WG)

1.1. A slightly different WG

1.2. Team and issues to discuss

1.3. Outputs to deliver and in progress

[<https://www.environmentalprosecutors.eu/eu-life-project>]



1.1. A slightly different WG

$\frac{3}{4}$ are subject-focused

$\frac{1}{4}$ looks at overarching practice

WG 1 Wildlife

WG 2 Waste

WG 3 Chemicals (Air)

WG 4 Sanctioning:
prosecution and judicial
practice

- Issues hindering efficient and effective prosecution and adjudication
 - ENPE

- Sanctioning
- ENPE & EUFJE

1.2. Team and issues to discuss

Team

Belgium – P/J

Croatia – J

Czech Republic – P

France – J & J

Germany – P & P

Latvia – P

The Netherlands – J(P)

Spain – P

Issues to discuss

“Proportionate, effective & dissuasive” sanctioning

1/ Administrative >< criminal sanctioning - *What best when?*

2/ How prosecutors seek to apply sanctions, how judges apply sanctions in criminal *and administrative* contexts

3/ Ongoing *practical implications* Eco-crime Directive. Extent to which *differences in sanctioning practices* undermine enforcement and other EU policies (cohesion common market)

1.3. Outputs to deliver and in progress

Contents

Late 2017: interim findings and report

Late 2018: idem

Late 2019: final findings and report

Training materials

Challenges regarding the development and 'canning' of training materials

Strategy development: in progress (all 4 WG together)

2. Prosecution and sanctioning practice: the work in progress

2.1. Problems, trends and good practices in
prosecution and sanctioning

2.2. Proportionality in prosecution and
sanctioning



2.1. Problems, trends and good practices

- Questionnaire > input > analysis > discussion and additional input > analysis > recommendations

- Some findings
 - 1/ The absence of level playing field in environmental law enforcement appears in the criminal sanctioning track as a whole and, more importantly, the system-wide organisation of the public law enforcement (PLE) (the coexistence of the administrative and criminal sanctioning tracks (><sanctions used))
 - 2/ Trends tend to be positive trends

3/ Difficulties point to *the lack of legislative quality at different crucial levels*:

- communication of information throughout the enforcement chain
- incoherence in the PLE system
- lack of care for the enforceability of standards
- lack of care for the phrasing of offenses on prosecution chances
- underequipped sanctioning toolboxes
- insufficient attention paid to general criminal law

2.2. Proportionality in prosecution and sanctioning

2.2.1. *Why* work on proportionality?

Proportionality is a key issue for prosecutors as well as judges

Prosecutors: ~ in “the prosecutors kitchen”

- prosecutors range of options
- prosecution decisions
- prosecution sentencing claims

Judges: ~ in sentencing

2.2.2. *How tackling ~?*

An approach through gravity factors

- Gravity factors >< sentencing guidelines
 - Useful for prosecutors and judges
 - An easy access to a complicated and abstract issue
 - Fit to inform a wide range of proportionality issues and allows to explore the co-existence of the administrative and criminal sanctioning tracks

- Two touch-base documents
 - England & Wales Sentencing Guidelines (2014)
 - Recommendation n° 177 (2015) on the gravity factors and sentencing principles for the evaluation of offences against birds

➤ First findings, to investigate

1/ The balance between harm and culpability

2/ The knowledge of harm

ENPE

Thank you

LIFE14 GIE/UK000043

