8TH MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY OF USERS ON SECURE, SAFE AND RESILIENT SOCIETIES

CoU PLENARY MEETING

12 September 2017

Brussels, BAO Congress Centre (rue Félix Hap 11, 1040 Brussels)

Convener: **Philippe Quevauviller** (DG Home)

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING

*All presentations are available on the CoU website***: https:// www.securityresearch-cou.eu**

Summary

The Community of Users held its eighth meeting at the BAO Congress Centre in Brussels, and on the first day a plenary event with around 130 participants was organised. The event was also web streamed for parties interested in joining the meeting remotely.

The first part of the plenary started with a key note speech by Deputy Director General **Olivier Onidi** (DG Home), followed by a speech of the **Anabela Gago**, the Head of Unit of Secure Societies Programme (DG Home) on the State of Play of the Work Programme 2018-.2020. The morning session continued with a presentation on Science for Disaster Risk Management by the Head of Unit of the Disaster Risk Management Knowledge Centre **Ian Clark** (Joint Research Centre) and an introduction to the EU Urban Agenda on Climate Adaptation by **Stefania Manca** (Municipality of Genoa, IT). Subsequently, **Clive Goodchild** (BAE Systems, UK) gave a speech on "Boosting innovation in the CBRN area". The morning concluded with a roundtable on CBRN resilience in the European Union convened by **Carlos Rojas Palma** (SCK-CEN, Belgium) and Q&A session.

The second part of the event consisted of an overview of the 2017 forest fire season to date by **Apostolos Paralikas** (DG ECHO) followed by a round-table discussion on how to link research and practitioners for a better forest fire risk management, convened by **Laura Schmidt** (DG ECHO).
During the following presentation "Preparing for the next pandemic", **K. Harald Drager** and **Thomas Robertson** (TIEMS) gave an overview of the ASSET-EU project finding and conclusions.
CoU-2018 perspectives and conclusions. The meeting ended with an overview of the main conclusions by **Philippe Quevauviller** (DG HOME).

This report provides an overview of the speeches, presentations, discussions and Q&A sessions during the Eighth Community of Users Meeting, a multi-stakeholder initiative facilitated by DG HOME.

Welcome key note by Olivier Onidi, Deputy Director-General (DG HOME)

The meeting was opened by **Olivier Onidi** (DG HOME), Deputy Director-General. He welcomed the participants and those following the meeting via web streaming. He introduced himself and briefly summarized the main message of the 7th CoU meeting held in May 2017, which was to conduct more research and make better use of it. The meeting underlined the importance of getting a better sense of the direction on the type of research that needs to be conducted and demonstrated the need of being more prescriptive about the types of (desired) outcomes we want from the many different research initiatives. At the same time, he stressed the importance of research as a vital factor to face different security threats and referred to the Euro-barometer that came out last week, which clearly showed that European citizens are overwhelmed by the type of security threats we are facing. He pointed out the need for collective action to respond to the threats and ascertained that technology research is the least developed dimension in the security sector. Topics ranging from cyber security to counter-terrorism and CBRN all require innovative ideas if we are to respond with resolve and resilience.

The expectations from the research programmes are very high and there is a lot of interest from decision makers in research related to innovative security. The CoU provides a unique platform to explore what is needed in the next generation of research (technology and social research – e.g. radicalisation). Next year, the CoU meetings will be organised thematically. Mr Onidi called on all participants to keep up their commitment and the pace of discussions with practitioners and other users for continued guidance and for improvement of research outputs in terms of deployment and explanations of what research can do to enhance security.

Presentation – Anabela Gago, Head of Unit, Secure Societies Programme (DG HOME), State of Play of Work Programme 2018-2020

Anabela Gago introduced the draft work programme 2018 to 2020 that will be adopted on the 21st of October. The new programme is the culmination of the current EU research strategy. It is an opportunity to adjust and improve the H2020 programme based on the mid-term evaluation published in June, the CoU meeting outcomes, and other fora. Ms Gago stressed that it is crucial to think beyond 2020. To this end, she outlined a number of priority areas for the coming years. There is a mandate to improve current and future research in terms of bringing results to market.

The 1st Flagship topic for the 2018-2020 programme is open pre-commercial procurement (PCP). The goal: enable public authorities to come together to develop innovative ideas with the right stakeholders and provide opportunities to jointly procure. This should modernize public procurement faster and enable practitioners and other users to get the most effective tools to address needs related to prevention, combating terrorism and resilience. It also presents opportunities for companies and other solution providers in Europe to be more competitive and take on a leadership role at an international level.

Open topics that will fall under the PCP flagship programme include:

1) Study like approaches to assess the feasibility of PCP in any given field;

2) Proposals already mature for a fully-fledged PCP project.

The openness of PCP will enable flexibility to address fast-moving threats. This is a key gap in the current research structure.

The 2017 secure societies call finished 2 weeks ago. Over-subscription has been substantially reduced. The concept of overarching topics will remain (both specific and open sub-topics). The SME instrument will also continue, with a full-fledged bottom-up approach. A new instrument that will be launched is the so-called Fast Track to Innovation (FTI). It is part of a broader preparation strategy for security research (beyond 2020). The 2018-2020 H2020 programme will need to bridge the transition period and prove the efficacy of research as a tool to combating increasing (security) threats. Moreover, in order to succeed, research will need to be more focused. Technologies, solutions and other research outputs need to better match the needs of practitioners and end users and contribute to the improved competitiveness of industry.

Only a few EU MS have their own national research programme. Most rely on H2020 for security research. Cross-border cooperation needs to be highlighted again. Fragmented approaches, different standards, duplication of work, lack of interoperability etc. are all affecting ability to respond collectively to emerging threats. The four broader focus areas in H2020 will be: reinforcing security union, low carbon resilient future, digitisation of European industry, circular economy.

Presentation of the DRM 2017 report, Ian Clark, Head of Unit, Disaster Risk Management Knowledge Centre (Joint Research Centre)

Ian Clark presented the DRMKC Science for DRM 2017 report: "Knowing better and losing less". The publication is not about creating more knowledge, but better knowledge; by reviewing and summarizing existing knowledge. Disaster management in particular lacks a scientific foundation. There are many gaps, including, for example, communicating disaster risk (using local knowledge) for better risk awareness. Moreover, some topics are not yet addressed (e.g. cyber security).

The main messages of the report include:

- We need a better knowledge management system. Resilience needs to start at local level, but if science cannot be understood at local level then it is not of much service.
- Data revolution. Are we managing to understand the data and using it in a coherent way?
- More innovation needed in Earth Observation (in-situ, airborne and satellite centres).
- Recent disasters; was information sufficiently accurate and timely?

Following a question from the audience, Mr Clark points to three current deficits in disaster risk management (coming out of the report):

- Common approaches for risk assessment. Learning for ways issues are undertaken

- Interoperability around assets and common standards
- Plans for disciplinary research. Still in its infancy. More is needed to bring scientists together
- Economists are not fully involved in disaster risk area.

The full report covers over 400 pages and includes state of the art reflections by some of the leading scientists in the DRM field. There is a summary available online (DRMKC website).

Presentation -- The EU Urban Agenda on Climate Adaptation by Stefania Manca, Municipality of GENOA, Italy (CIMA Foundation, IT)

In her presentation, Stefania Manca gave an overview of how the municipality of Genoa is planning to implement the EU Urban agenda on Climate Adaptation. "We want to raise awareness of who, where, what we are and do", she said in her introduction. She further noted that there are a lot of initiatives from EU funding focused on decreasing hazards, exposure and vulnerability. The main challenge hereby is to ensure the sustainability of the project outcomes. Therefore, a more systematic approach to ensure better assessment of local adaptation actions is needed, for example by exploiting synergies.

The overall purpose of the initiative is to bring together researchers, practitioners, public institutions in order to better collaborate and tackle challenges in a new way. The initiative is in accordance with the Amsterdam rules and covers 12 priority principles (including e.g. air quality, circular economy, climate adaptation) leading to 12 partnerships. The main objectives are: better regulation, better funding and better knowledge. Looking forward it will take 1.5 years to implement concrete actions. As a next step an orientation paper that will serve as the guideline for their work will be published for consultation. Moreover, an action will contain concrete actions and stakeholder engagement (who can support where) is being developed. Ms. Manca concluded her presentation with her mission statement: "We need to not just mind the gap but fill the gap."

Remarks from the audience:

Philippe Quevauviller: The Community of Users is working at different levels. The most practical dimension is the regional level and the city. Security actions are usually taken locally. On the 30th of June, a meeting was convened with a large number of H2020 MS contact points to explore what initiatives exist at national level, including multi-actor, multi-stakeholder platform agreements that could be considered as an extension of the CoU principles at the national level. The meeting proved of much interest to participants, who jointly appreciated the need to improve the uptake of EU research results at national level. We are progressing slowly, but surely.

Georgios Kolliarakis (University of Frankfurt): Developing technologies only possible in the context of applications (technological, institutional, etc.) These enabling conditions are essential. Community building and knowledge transfer enables and constrains knowledge intake and uptake. One area that is still very underdeveloped in Europe is artificial intelligence.

Angelos Charlaftis (Greek independent researcher): There appears to be little awareness as an organized society around safety and security. In USA more organized than in EU. E.g. on integrating civil applications such as AI to security.

Juha Rautjarvi (Finnish independent consultant): Getting knowledge to the institutional level. Matter of intelligence. Depends on human dimension and personal engagement. Only get through if you have personal relationships. Then you open up possibilities.

Presentation – Boosting innovation in the CBRN area, the ENCIRCLE network, Clive Goodchild (BAE Systems, UK)

Clive Goodchild provides an update of the ENCIRCLE project. ENCIRCLE has five key objectives aimed at promoting innovation and business development to fill market gaps in the project timeframe:

- Create an open and neutral EU CBRN cluster,
- Provide a sustainable and flexible vision and roadmap for the development of the European CBRN market and innovations,
- Provide integration with platforms (systems, tools, services, products) by proposing standardized interfaces and future EU standards to integrate CBRN technologies and innovations developed from the Part b projects of the H2020-SEC-05-DRS CBRN Cluster call,
- Support CBRN safety, security and defence commercial and market services,
- Improve and facilitate European CBRN dissemination and exploitation.

The project is conducted by a consortium of specialized industries, trade associations and research organisations with flexible and lean procedures under the advice of the EC Community of Users. It will rely on two large interactive communities: practitioners and customers, and industrial and technological providers: the latter including many SMEs. Policy considerations mainly involve the fragmented (policy) landscape. Not clear who the conductor is of CBRN issues, but the outputs need to match with EU industrial policy. ERNCIP is a network of interest in this regard. Their best practices might be useful for ENCIRCLE. To optimise the needs and gaps assessment, as well as innovation development, acceptance and success, ENCIRCLE will establish formal links with other consortia such as future so-called "Part b" projects. Challenge: identifying early adopters who can take products to the market.

The main expected impact is the enhancement of the EU CBRN industry's competitiveness. This will allow it to enlarge its market share while increasing the benefits of the EU research and innovation to improve CBRN preparedness, response, resilience and recovery efficiency. Moreover, ENCIRCLE will enhance collaborations in a number of ways:

- Link new innovations to platforms (connect to other suppliers)
- Identify new funding instruments to take products to market
- Provide guidance for developing business plans

Round table 1: CBRN resilience in the European Union – Coordination and supporting needs

Chaired by: Carlos Rojas Palma (SCK-CEN, Belgium)

Panellists: Wiktor Wojtas (DG HOME), Patricia Compard (Standardisation expert, Police Commissioner French Ministry of Interior), Shahzad Ali (European Defence Agency), Hans de Neef (Belgium National Crisis Center), Tristan Simonart (DG DEVCO)

Carlos Rojas Palma introduced the panel and invited the panel members to introduce themselves and provide a short resume on their main coordination and supporting needs for enhancing CBRN resilience.

Patricia Compard (French Ministry of Interior): Expert risk and crisis management. Standards are a tool to enhance resilience within Europe. Regarding CBRN issues that are technically difficult to address. We need processes that help address challenges in a concrete way. We need to know and understand risks and threats. But the policy world is fragmented and implementation is very nationally oriented. Disasters and risks don't take into account borders. Our responsibility is to do what we can, to improve coordination and support needs at a higher, cross-border level. Currently, there is a lack of standards in processes. How can we have policies, actions, research improved so that processes become more streamlined etc.? How to ensure we reach the right communities in the right areas with the right messages? Standards on training could include, e.g. RBC, exercising, a lessons learned framework. They should take into account both perceived and actual threats, as the perception of threats is growing more than the actual threat level.

Wiktor Wojtas (DG HOME): CBRN expert. The biggest challenge in the CBRN domain is a lack of political commitment on all levels. The implementation of research is critical. However, there is a problem linking research to practitioners. Once you get research results, you need someone to decide that it should be pushed further and implemented. As long as there is no message from the top that CBRN is a priority, there is little incentive at lower levels to push forward. Counter-terrorism and radicalisation is less research oriented, the EU CBRN policy action plan outdated (expired 2 years ago) and there is nothing in place now for further implementation. The main reason? A lack of commitment. The situation is worse in MS (Sweden is an exception) as it is very difficult to get (more) funding from national governments. Requests for funding, projects, staff in CBRN poses a real challenge.

Shahzad Ali (European Defence Agency): Synergies between civilian, military and space R&T. Almost half of EDA MS' (13) participate in the Management Committee of the Joint Investment

Programme on CBRN Protection, addressing specific defence R&T needs. Budget: 12 million euros. 14 projects. The CapTech CBRN is now in the process of evaluating and updating the CBRN Strategic Research Agenda (SRA). This SRA will provide a roadmap for the identified gaps and MS' priorities. The cooperation between EDA and the European Space Agency (ESA) has been further intensified with a joint workshop hosted in march this year and a call launched in Q2 2017 on the topic: "Space Based Services In Support of CBRNe Operations". In addition, EDA is working on an "Innovation in defence" challenge. Civil and commercial markets drive innovation in many underlying technologies. Therefore, non-traditional defence communities need to be involved in order to speed up emerging and potentially disruptive results. In 2018, EDA will launch one of the first defence innovation challenges in the area of CBRN to identify ideas with potential impact either on future defence capabilities or existing defence capability gaps.

Hans de Neef (Belgium National Crisis Center): we are currently developing national emergency plans in Belgium. Challenge: integrating them. Need to look for these plans in an integrated manner security/safety. New DG. One of the BNCC's first actions: create a national CBRN expertise centre: a platform integrating practitioners, experts, developers. Development of actions, procedures and formation per actor in emergency plans, with priority for first responders. The mission is to strengthen security governance at a strategic and operational level and go beyond covering accidental risk. For example, the BNCC is currently developing a CBRN contingency plan.CBRN experts should be immediately present at the event in a real emergency situation situation (main goal) so policy makers can make informed decisions
Mapping of other European crisis centres is an attention point as the organisation of crisis centres is not organized in the same way across the board. The BNCC is competent for both safety/security risks which is rather unique. R&D collaboration at national and international level and EU research projects and insert the results in emergency preparedness and crisis management is also new. Options at level of training centres is currently being elaborated by the H2020 E-Notice project. This can potentially provide an enormous boost to improve cooperation across the EU. Ultimately, it is all about changing mindsets around emergency plans (preparedness and integrated approach).

Tristan Simonart (DG DEVCO): the EU and the security landscape is changing. The EU (and DEVCO) is willing to be a player and not just a funder of international development measures in the field of security. To this end, a closer interaction between the CoU and the external network of DEVCO CBRN Centres of Excellence (60 countries) will become of increasing importance. DEVCO has a network of (national) experts that can support further collaboration and governance in the CBRN area. Each partner country has a national team of CBRN experts belonging to relevant CBRN ministries covering accidental and/or intentional risk. Working on a regular basis. 8 regional centres that do table top exercises, etc. There already is a strong contribution to CBNR governance at international level. We now need to connect better the EU (internal) dimension with the international (external) dimension. Stronger connection is needed between the EU CBRN network and the international CBRN network, especially in the European Neighbourhood countries, where DEVCO is developing cross-border

activity training, mutual exercises etc. Political backing and support (bilaterally and multilaterally) is a must.

Q & A round table 1

Q. Resilience and coordinating needs.
Do DG HOME and EDA work together closely to create research topics? Not adequately. Philippe Quevauviller: We need to map synergies between CBRN issues that have links to defence.

Q. Medical aspects of CBRN (posed by American participant**)**. Specific drugs that you need to stockpile in case of an attack (for immediate treatment). How does the EU, Belgium, France look at the medical aspects of CBRN?
Patricia Compard: The medical side is a whole chain that forms part of preparedness. Example project: enhancing security in health care facilities so that they are well managed during emergencies.

Q. Standards for CBRN (posed by a Norwegian participant). There is a DRS-7 project looking at creating standardized guidelines at EU level for CBRN. How to implement this in a more harmonized manner? Should not wait until project is done, but within life of project as soon as something is eligible for standardization connect with standardization community and relevant stakeholders, sectors and countries to ensure that standards are actually co-owned and used.
Philippe Quevauviller: we are currently working on a standardization roadmap. Also: RESISTAND project.
Dennis Davis: Most of CBRN capability exists because there is a general hazardous materials risk but we are now facing different sort of environment and can't be sure what the next threat will be. A lot of assets and training exists but are not held together. The Standardisation process can work against it, because it puts assets back in silos. Better to look at developing frameworks, protocols, procedures that enable us to take up existing best practice, for example Dutch, French, German, and utilise it in a matter of hours. We should also ask ourselves who is pushing for standards within the EU that are really working.
Patricia Compard: There are too many standards that are not relevant. We should focus and find the operational systems that work on the ground

Presentation – Overview of 2017 forest fire season to date, by Apostolos Paralikas (DG ECHO)
Mr Paralikas provided an overview of the 2017 forest fire season. Managing forest fires is one of the great challenges in EU emergency management. Early in the forest fire season, all MS usually have enough resources to provide assistance to others. Later on in the season this becomes more difficult, as most MS have national emergencies to deal with. An additional challenge is the intensive use of existing resources and corresponding need for more maintenance of equipment, etc.. Further collaboration between MS to remedy the current capability gaps should be explored.

Round table 2: Linking research and practitioners for a better forest fire risk management, convened by Laura Schmidt (DG ECHO)

Chaired by: Laura Schmidt (DG ECHO)

Round-table panellists: Isabelle Linde-Frech (Fraunhofer-INT), Dennis Davis (International Fire Fighter Association), Nicolas Faivre (DG RTD), Giovanni Fresu (Italian National Fire Service), Apostolos Paralikas (DG ECHO)

Laura Schmidt opened the session and posed three questions on linking science and operations for better forest fire management for the panel to consider:

How can we better forecast the intensity of a forest fire season?
How can we identify and address prevention gaps, e.g. linking risk assessments to scenario planning?
How can we improve mapping, e.g. through satellite applications (both inside and outside EU)?

Nicolas Faivre (DG RTD, expert in fire ecology): The recent fire seasons and extreme events led to concerns about how research and innovation outcomes were used by practitioners and mainstreamed and influencing policy. How was research helpful and uptaken by forest practitioners, decision-makers and end users? Different methodologies and tools were used. How was research taken up? With the aim to improve the dissemination, knowledge of and impact of EU R&I results in the field, a more in depth analysis in the form of a Project Review on Forest Fires (H2020, FP7 and UCPM, LIFE+) has been launched in September and will highlight how EU R&I efforts have facilitated or stimulated innovations, new management and adoption of measures, as well as governance strategies. as the basis for a dedicated multi-stakeholder workshop in early 2018. Results of this thorough review are expected end of this year and the outcome will be used in the new H2020 research programming. Interlinked with the review, a multi-stakeholder workshop 'How to face mega-fires in Europe' will be organised early 2018 in Portugal. This will involve several EC services (ECHO, JRC, ENV, HOME, etc.) and provide a unique dialogue opportunity for multiple stakeholders in the field. As such, the workshop shall confront the perspectives of decision-makers, forest practitioners and fire scientists on what should be an integrated forest fire management strategy which responds to future trends in fire activity across Europe.

Isabelle Linde-Frech (Fraunhofer-INT): Development of capabilities in pan-European networks. Focus: fire networks. Lots of fragmentation. No matter what capability development process you are talking about. Create sustainable process to get practitioners actively engaged but also to overcome fragmentation between existing networks. There are tree main lines of action:

1. Identification of capability gaps in fire networks (vegetation or landscape fires)
2. Scouting ideas for closing gaps (training, capacity building etc.)
3. Fire rescue and standardisation agenda.

Biggest capability challenge: science-policy interface. Fragmentation of initiatives. Improve best practices. Gather operational needs. Many of them are related to information sharing. Identifying and harmonising them.

Giovanni Fresu (Italian National Fire Service): We are dealing with a new type of fires: the so-called 5th generation of fires. This is a combination of large forest fires and fires in the rural-urban interface. Fire fighting service may not have capacity to meet all simultaneous needs. Need to cultivate culture of self-protection where communities are able to fight back. Transfer between research and tech and operative does not have adequate channels. Building a network of professionals may be the key. Obtain important information and share in open network to help find future solutions. Challenge: collaboration between researchers + operational teams. Latter lacks knowledge of researcher methods. Different disciplines and needs to meet rather diverse challenges: Fire prevention , Fire use, Suppression of wildfires, Command and Control and Preparedness.

Dennis Davis (International Fire Fighter Association): We must ask what is transferable at EU level and clarify the different definitions and variations. It is also an area with tremendous amount of research that requires interpretation. Use the research to add understanding on fire ignition, prevention, behaviour, suppression and informatics. We need to think seriously about building community resilience. Resilience is a pathway and part of the solution. It has to be underpinned by culture. People need to accept the notion that the fire is going to happen. Wildfire growth of fires in Mediterranean area is also serving as a warning for the northern EU MS. The latter group is unable to effectively respond or receive assistance at the moment. Key is better land-use control and management needs to be in place to protect the wildland-urban interface in high risk areas. Ultimately, it is not about developing standards but about transferring knowledge, improving harmonisation. Great; package the response, but don't package how you use the response. That's a logic works, e.g. use satellite maps to show where vegetation is at risk and where fire occurrence has been increasing due to decrease in population. Strategic level (big issues): the affected countries are overwhelmed. Areas to be researched needs to be fed into a flexible, adaptable process.

Q & A Round table 2

Q. Role of private sector and civil society (Horst Kraemer). We are currently missing in the discussions is the key role the private sector has to play. A lot of forests are privately owned. Industries (e.g. agriculture) also have a stake. There are hard economic interests to consider. Moreover, where are the associations that represent those citizens that have experienced those fires first hand? They need a voice as well. NGOs and volunteer organisations are part of the community

and already readily involved on issues of climate change mitigation etc. Flooding is currently the best example of where communities have been able to build and transfer knowledge.

Dennis Davis: Firefighting is a national activity so it is dealt with at a national level. All the sectors are involved, but at national level. You can go to bigger organisations that are an umbrella. The citizen and community resilience (culture) is where the major challenge lies now. There is creep caused by climate change moving from south to north of Europe. We ALL are facing these issues. Need to engage at national, EU, international. Linking researcher to practitioner. Flooding is one of the best examples decade ago similar things were happening. There is a mechanism. EU and DGs are so involved it seems like a European issue, even if faced at national level.

Isabelle Frech: Money is the driving force. Civil protection is about protection of society. Research that treats development of crisis management that does not look at ethical, societal, legal and economic aspects, is useless. Each and every solution will fit into existing systems. Therefore must understand those systems and how it fits. Difficult to develop solutions that could be fed into more systems. Always link to general levels of civil protection and try and linking capability processes to rest of civil protection world.

Further questions and remarks from the audience

Georgios Kolliarakis (University of Frankfurt): How far back will you go with your review? What is the purpose of the review? Lots of research results are outdated. The main problem: exploitation and use of outputs of research. What is the purpose of having research calls? Why not support the implementation and operationalisation of projects that have been completed.

Nicolas Faivre: RTD projects and FP6 projects cover decade of research. Some of results of research are still very much valid. E.g. FUME project. Major FP7 project. Look at ecosystem management via new fire regimes and climate impact. Not trying to analyse in depth what research was dealing with. But how clustering of projects can be done and results can be exploited in a format that is understandable not just to scientists but also other stakeholders. JRC and DRMKC is a vehicle. Search for information. H2020, capacity building, ISF, LIFE+ and interreg. No mechanism how research can feed into capacity building. Next year we will have a full picture what we are doing in ISF, H2020, LIFE+ etc.

Finian Joyce (Representative of Fire Association in Europe): DG ECHO provided an excellent presentation of fire fighting situation in Europe. Much info about the Granville Fire, UK. Public enquiries, Commission enquires. Is there a similar outcry about the recent Portugal fire? 64 people died! Review needs to be done. Why did 64 people die?! Top priority: reduce loss of life. This should be followed up. Wildland-urban interface is key issue. Properties need to be clearly zoned, no built so

close to the edge of the forests. Culture of self-protection is key. Community of resilience needs basic measures if citizens are to protect themselves (or at least have a plan to evacuate).

Juha Rautjarvi (Finnish independent consultant): How is ethics addressed? Sense of responsibility?

Dennis Davis: It is not just about ethics. It is the way we relate to our communities. Need to shift back the responsibility back to the citizen. Latter cannot rely solely on researchers and scientists and policy makers. Improving the resilience of the general public is key.

Q. What is the current policy at national level involving citizens in forest management in order to decrease risk and increase awareness of people living in the areas affected?

Nicolas Faivre: 85% of forests are privately owned. Poor management of land has resulted in higher risk areas (e.g. planting of eucalyptus making areas highly flammable). Wildland – urban interface is a key issue. However, focusing on properties being built in high-risk areas is not the right approach. There are properties on areas that were previously in low-risk areas that are now also high-risk areas. Key question should be: how do you conceive of a fire response strategy in the context of increasing mega-fires.

Laura Schmidt asked the panel members to conclude their remarks answering the following question:
Q. How do we set up effective networks to help respond to (big) forest fires?

Dennis Davis: Networks out there are reasonably well established but need to be integrated. Useful to map them and how they can be drawn together. Challenge: they are cross-disciplinary (climate, agriculture, civil protection). They need to be integrated. Also, consider land use control and management and other areas of research that could help fire fighters. Finally, we need better social education. People have to be educated about the do's and don'ts during forest fires and what they can do to be safe.

Giovanni Fresu: focus first on forest land management. Need forest land policy at local, national, regional, and EU level. Oriented to preserve landscape and to protect people. This goes hand in hand with social education and cultural awareness.

Isabelle Frech**:** Main challenge: there are different views on how long it takes to develop new solutions to the forest fire threat. Need long term strategies and trajectories. Foresight and strategic capability development in organisations is key if you are going to get something out of research. We need to be better prepared. 100 people died during Pedro Portugal (forest fire). This is unacceptable.

Other reflections

- We need to consider using Copernicus for these types of questions. Data in earth system and space data in forest fire management is missing.
- The only thing that can manage the system is the human in the system. This needs to be understood. Not about changing legislation, systems, technologies. It is about how we behave and react to disasters.
- Why is there no exclusion zone for building houses in high risk areas?

Philippe Quevauviller**:** There is a clear need to work on social preparedness. Work programme DG HOME will focus on this human dimension.

Presentation – Preparing for the next pandemic! The ASSET EU-project findings and conclusions, by K. Harald Drager and Thomas Robertson (TIEMS)

The 2009 H1N1 Pandemic provided the main impetus for the ASSET project. Aims of ASSET: Improve response to pandemics and other health emergencies and forge partnerships with complementary objectives, knowledge and experience to address scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics. ASSET brought doctors and engineers together. This proved to be a good complementary collaboration.

How were aims translated into activities? Science and society issues considered:

- Governance (interaction authorities + public)
- Science (how can we engage public in drug approval processes)
- Ethics (principles + processed)
- Gender equality (interaction with society)
- Bioterrorism (interaction with society)

On the basis of the above, an action plan was developed with citizen consultation. This was further refined via an interactive High-level Policy FORUM that involved numerous stakeholders: authorities, Healthcare Professionals, Science, Industry, Media, and Public. Surveys were not sufficient as knowledge levels varied, so an interactive workshop was held instead. Spent half day informing the experts about the issue (create a shared understanding) and the second half was used to get input, feedback and validation. In terms of impact, the project helped to restore trust, SIS Issues considered, increased awareness and knowledge, a two way active transparent multidisciplinary communication. Moreover, the project helped to manage uncertainty and misinformation.

Wrap up – Philippe Quevauviller (DG HOME), CoU 2018 perspectives and conclusions

2018: will focus on a more thematic approach. Meetings will be organised according to themes, involving relevant DGs and research (projects). Philippe presented the 'new' CoU Tree. This naïve presentation of the Community of Users is designed to reduce the complexity of the security research landscape. The CoU Tree will need to be regularly updated so that it is fully aligned with relevant policy issues and research needs. It also needs to respond and resonate with people at the user level (practitioners, industry). It is all part of a broader CoU effort to bring people together. Since the launch of the CoU in January 2014, the enthusiasm is still on. However, in order to keep momentum, we need to take a step further and take a more concrete step towards synergy building. The thematic organisation of the CoU meetings in 2018 should help to facilitate this.

Further important considerations:

Developing Communities of Practice. Having people in given thematic areas sharing knowledge and information about projects. Not just about research, also about capacity building programmes. DG ECHO, LIFE+, Interreg, Education (Erasmus, Marie-Curie) Etc. Bringing information together creates a critical mass. This will be a key instrument for developing the Community of Users at thematic level moving forward.

We will not focus on hierarchy in policy, but overarching international conventions. These do not necessarily need to be legally binding. We take them in our EU laws and implement them (e.g. SENDAI via UCPM). Lots of connections between the UCPM and different implementation threads. Umbrella should look at natural disasters, chemical disasters, terrorism. Broad view of safety and security issues. CP mechanism cannot be implemented if legislation is not implemented. Etc. Complex legal system needs to be connected. Ensure research and capacity building projects need to be connected to them and relevance / utility needs to be communicated directly to stakeholders. Philippe: facilitator to bring people together. Human dimension.

Scientist speaking directly to policy maker or defining needs for industry has blind spots. Knowledge of the full, more complex, system is lacking. Leads to communication problems. Need to change this. All stakeholders have a specific role (e.g. a researcher focuses on research). What we need more than ever are mediators: people who are connecting the different actors in the middle. These mediators (or champions) are rare. They are (often) old wise men and women, but not always. Where are they? We will need to identify them.

CBRN-E example.
How to reach users? Can be policy makers, industry SMEs, researchers. CBRN-E is not a community as such. C, B, R, N are sub-communities in their own right. Technically should be able to tell these sub-communities what we are developing (tools). At CBRN-E level, we speak at a level higher: link to international and EU policies. Research, innovation and capacity building: clustering needs (synergies and database of projects) so that outputs can be more clearly defined and provided.

Involvement of practitioners and civil society.

Projects will need active practitioner involvement, not just steering committees, from Kick-Off-Meeting until the end. Eligibility criteria for calls have been strengthened to include these considerations. By not tailoring research to users risk is that outputs are not used.

Involving civil society is the big challenge moving forward. If we are willing to discuss security and safety issues in an integrated way, we need to break the silos. Aim CoU: per theme, facilitate discussions in an integrated way.

Next year:

There are three CoU meetings planned in March, June, and November. Each meeting will be 5 days long (1 working week).18 different themes will be covered in total, 6 themes per meeting. In addition, an annual gathering will be organised with all project coordinators (research, CB, education, policies, industry). Round tables at different sector level: science-science debate (not presentations, but interaction), policy-policy (EU, MS, regional), industry (with presentations), policy to research and innovation (gathering projects with innovation potential (tools, technologies with TRL > 6), Setting the scene and interactions with practitioners. Commissioners will be invited at High Level segment on Mondays. DGs at the Conclusions meeting on Fridays, so they can take the main messages home.

The meeting was closed at 16h35.