

10. Annex

10.1 Table: Analytical Indicators

Hypotheses	Indicators
<p>H1: The more the UNSC exhibits incentive structures, the stronger the change it may cause and thus the influence it may exert on the EU's CTF financial sanction regime.</p> <p>H2: The more the UNSC creates and amplifies norms and rules through processes of persuasion, social influence or group pressure, the stronger the change it may cause and thus the influence it may exert on the EU's CTF financial sanction regime.</p> <p>H3: The more UNSC creates path-dependencies and historical dependence, the stronger the change it may cause and thus the influence it may exert on the EU's CTF financial sanction regime.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change in the EU's CTF financial sanction system (before 9/11 and after) (inclusion of factors that influenced/have been influencing the development). Possible range of change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High • Medium • Low 2) Resemblances respectively differences between the UN's and the EU's CTF sanction regime. Possible range of resemblance/difference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High, • Medium • Low 3) Adoption of UNSCRs. Range of possibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No adoption • Adoption with changes • Literal adoption 4) Implementation of UNSCRs concerning CTF. Possible range of implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High • Medium • Low
<p>H4: The less decisions are being made according to unanimity voting and the more decisions are being made based upon majority voting, the more the EU is susceptible to change and thus to be influenced by the UNSC.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Institutional decision-making procedure of the European Union when it comes to the adoption of CTF sanctions. Range of decision-making: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimity in the Council • Informal governance mechanisms • Qualified Majority Voting • Mixed form of the three above mentioned indicators

Table 1

Source: Own Model

10.2 Table: Current CTF Sanctions at EU Level

Classification/Country	Origin	Type(s) of Sanctions	Details
Afghanistan	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arms export Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The initial UNSCR 1267 (1999) was adopted against Afghanistan and the Taliban The complementary UNSCRs 1988 (2011) and 1989 (2011) expanded the subjects to the resolutions by ISIL (Da'esh), Al-Qaida and associated individuals, groups, undertakings and entities
Bosnia & Herzegovina	EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sanctions were adopted on 21 March 2011 “[...] against certain natural and legal persons whose activities undermine the sovereignty, territorial integrity, constitutional order and international personality of Bosnia and Herzegovina, seriously threaten the security situation” (European Commission, n.d.).
Central African Republic	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arms export Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available Prohibition to satisfy claims Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The initial UNSCR 2134 (2014), updated in January 2017 (S/RES/2339), January 2018 (S/RES/2399) and lastly in September 2019 (S/RES/2488) by “[r]ecalling all of its previous resolutions, statements of its President and press statements on the situation in the Central African Republic” (UNSC, 2019). The UNSCRs were imposed “[...] due to the ongoing clashes between armed groups and other armed spoilers in their attempts to forcefully gain control of territory and resources and destabilize the country, as well as the lack of capacity of the national security forces [...]” (UNSC, 2018).
Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	UNSC and EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arms export Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available Prohibition to satisfy claims Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 21 December 2005, the UNSC adopted Resolution 1649 (2005) imposing restrictive measures on (foreign) armed groups and militias its members violently act against the territorial integrity of the DCR, “[...] the threat they pose to civilians [...]” and the stability in the country (UNSC, 2005). The sanctions have been updated and prolonged on 26 June 2019 (S/RES/2478). “On 17 October 2016, the EU expressed its deep concern at the political situation in the DRC. It strongly condemned the acts of extreme violence that took place on 19 and 20 September 2016 in Kinshasa, noting that those acts further exacerbated the deadlock in the country due to the failure to call

			<p>the presidential elections by the constitutional deadline of 20 December 2016” (European Commission, n.d.).</p> <p>Restrictive measures have been imposed on those persons “[...] who promote violence and those who try to obstruct a consensual and peaceful solution to the crisis which respects the aspiration of the people of the DRC to elect their representatives” (European Commission, n.d.; Council Decision (CFSP) 2016/2231).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU sanction regime consist of both, the UNSC and the EU provisions.
Guinea-Bissau	UNSC and EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 3 May 2012, the EU has been imposing restrictive measures “[...] targeting those who sought to prevent or block a peaceful political process or who took action that undermined stability in the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, in particular those who played a leading role in the [...] the coup d’état of 12 April 2012” (European Commission, n.d.). • “On 18 May 2012, the [UNSC] adopted a Resolution 2048 (2012), which imposed a travel ban on persons seeking to prevent the restoration of the constitutional order or taking action that undermines stability in the Republic of Guinea-Bissau” (European Commission, n.d.). • The EU sanction regime consist of both, the UNSC and the EU provisions.
Lebanon	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The terrorist bombing in Beirut, Lebanon on 14 February 2005 killed 23 people, including the former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri, and caused injury to dozens of people. On 31 October 2005, the [UNSC] adopted Resolution 1636 (2005), [...] [t]o assist in the investigation of the crime, the Security Council decided to impose measures against all individuals suspected of being involved in the planning, sponsoring, organizing or perpetrating the terrorist act. This restrictive measure regime applies also in relation to Lebanon.” (European Commission, n.d.).
Libya	UNSC and EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms export • Arms procurement • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Flights, airports, aircrafts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNSCR 1970 (2011), adopted on 26 February 2011 imposed sanctions on “[...] persons and entities involved in serious human rights abuses against persons in Libya. The [SC] has since adopted a number of other resolutions on Libya that have extended or amended the measures” (European Commission, n.d.). • Following the implementation of this UNSCR, the EU adopted additional sanctions.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspections • Ports and vessels • Ports and vessels • Ports and vessels • Prohibition to satisfy claims • Restrictions on admission • Restrictions on equipment used for internal repression • Vessels • Vigilance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In July 2017, the Council of the EU declared “[...] its readiness to repeal the restrictive measures if the conditions for their application are no longer met, as well as introduce new measures against individuals who threaten the peace, security or stability of the country, impede the completion of Libya's political transition and are responsible for serious human rights abuses” (European Commission, n.d.). • The EU sanction regime consist of both, the UNSC and the EU provisions.
Mali	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 5 September 2017, the [UNSC] adopted Resolution 2374 (2017) imposing travel restrictions and an asset freeze. Restrictive measures [are] imposed on those responsible for or complicit in, or having engaged in actions and policies that threaten the peace, security, or stability of Mali” (European Commission, n.d.).
Somalia	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms export • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Inspections • Restrictions on admission • Other items • Vigilance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 23 January 1992, in view of the rapid deterioration of the conflict in Somalia, the [UNSC] adopted Resolution 733 (1992), imposing an arms embargo. On 20 November 2008, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1844 (2008), introducing travel restrictions and an asset freeze against those who seek to prevent a peaceful political process, or those who threaten the Transitional Federal Institutions of Somalia or the African Union Mission in Somalia by force, or take action that undermines stability in the region” (European Commission, n.d.) • The sanctions have been updated and prolonged on 15 November 2019 (S/RES/2498).
South Sudan	UNSC and EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms export • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Council of the EU first adopted restrictive measures in relation to South Sudan on 10 July 2014, after the outbreak of a destructive conflict between the Government of South Sudan and opposition forces in December 2013. [Sanctioned were adopted] in relation to persons who obstruct the political process in South Sudan or are responsible for serious human rights violations” (European Commission, n.d.). • “[...] [On] 3 March 2015 the [UNSC] adopted Resolution 2206 (2015). In order to support the search

			for an inclusive and sustainable peace in South Sudan, restrictive measures were imposed against those who threaten the peace, security or stability of South Sudan” (European Commission, n.d.).
Syria	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cf. Lebanon
Terrorism	UNSC and EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms export • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Prohibition to satisfy claims • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 15 October 1999, restrictive measures were introduced in relation to the Taliban through [UNSCR] 1267 (1999). On 16 January 2002, the measures were extended to cover the Al-Qaida organization and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them (see Resolution 1390 (2002)). • In 2011, decided to split the restrictive measures in relation to the Taliban and those in relation to Al-Qaida into separate regimes. Measures in relation to Al-Qaida were gathered in Resolution 1989 (2011) (cf. Afghanistan). [...] • On 17 December 2015, the [UNSC] adopted Resolution 2253 (2015) expanding the scope of the measures to individuals, groups, undertakings or entities associated with the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (‘ISIL (Da’esh)’), responsible for ongoing and multiple criminal terrorist acts [...]. • As of 20 September 2016, the Council of the EU can apply restrictive measures autonomously to persons and entities associated with ISIL/Da’esh and Al-Qaida. Before that, the restrictive measures could be applied only to those listed by the UN Security Council” (European Commission, n.d.)
Terrorism	EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 8 October 2001, the Council of the EU reiterated the Union's determination to attack the sources which fund terrorism, in close cooperation with the United States. • On 27 December 2001, the Council of the EU adopted restrictive measures, providing inter alia for the freezing of funds of Usama bin Laden and individuals and entities associated with him” (European Commission, n.d.)
Ukraine	EU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 17 March 2014 the EU Council imposed an asset freeze and travel restrictions on those responsible for actions undermining or threatening the territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Ukraine” (European Commission, n.d.).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on admission 	
Yemen	UNSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arms export • Asset freeze and prohibition to make funds available • Inspections • Restrictions on admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “On 26 February 2014, in view of the ongoing violence, terrorist activities and political, security, economic and humanitarian challenges in Yemen, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2140 (2014)” (European Commission, n.d.). • The sanctions have been updated and prolonged on 26 June 2019 (S/RES/2456).

Table was adapted from the European Commission’s EU Sanction Map and complemented by own research using UNSCRs