

SDA ROUNDTABLE REPORT

# DOES EUROPE NEED “HOMELAND SECURITY”?

---



A ***Security & Defence Agenda*** Report

Rapporteur: David Koczij

Photos: François de Ribaucourt

Date of publication: **June 2010**

**SECURITY & DEFENCE AGENDA**

Bibliothèque Solvay, Parc Léopold,

137 rue Belliard, B-1040, Brussels, Belgium

T: +32 (0)2 737 91 48 F: +32 (0)2 736 32 16

E: [info@securitydefenceagenda.org](mailto:info@securitydefenceagenda.org) W: [www.securitydefenceagenda.org](http://www.securitydefenceagenda.org)

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?

## CONTENTS

<u>Programme</u>	p. 4
<u>Introduction</u>	p. 5
<u>Keynote Speech Cecilia Malmström</u>	p. 6
<u>Session I: Prospects for cooperation in building a European Homeland Security policy</u>	p.8
<u>Functionality and the current framework</u>	p.8
<u>A culture of cooperation</u>	p.10
<u>Building political consensus</u>	p.11
<u>Session II: Security &amp; resilience: the case of Critical Infrastructure Protection</u>	p.12
<u>What is Critical Infrastructure?</u>	p.12
<u>What is the danger?</u>	p.14
<u>Security research, technology and the cost of CIP</u>	p.15
<u>List of participants</u>	p.18
<u>About the SDA</u>	p.25
<u>SDA upcoming event</u>	p.26

## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?

Monthly Roundtable – Wednesday 12 May 2010

Bibliothèque Solvay, 12:30-16:30

### Session I - 12:30-14:00—Prospects for cooperation in building a European Homeland Security policy

Terrorist attacks in Europe since 9/11 have prompted greater efforts in European homeland security. What concrete achievements can EU governments and institutions point to? Is there now a greater coherence of national security policies in the EU, and what political will exists to go further towards creating a genuine EU strategy? How has the Lisbon treaty and the Commission portfolio reshuffle affected such a fundamentally inter-pillar issue, and should Europe consider creating a European Homeland Security Agency? What lessons can the EU draw from the US Department of Homeland Security experience?

#### Keynote Speech

**Cecilia Malmström**, European Commissioner for Home Affairs

#### Speakers

**Rafael Fernandez-Pita y Gonzalez**, Deputy Director, DG Justice and Home Affairs, Council of the EU

**Adam Isles**, Director for Strategy and Policy Consulting, Raytheon

**Rob Wainwright**, Director, Europol

### Members' Lunch – 14:00 – 15:00

### Session II – 15:00-16:30—Security & resilience: the case of Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)

Protecting critical infrastructures is the cornerstone of homeland security. To what extent have EU member states now agreed on a common definition of critical infrastructures with the design of new tools such as the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) and the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN)? Can Europe build a common framework that guarantees a better matching of needs and solutions in critical infrastructure protection? What role for NATO in CIP? Are public-private partnerships a viable option, and is it only larger companies that own critical infrastructures? In sectors as diverse as telecommunications, water, energy, transport and power, what terrorist attacks scenarios are being studied?

#### Speakers

**Dick Heimans**, Head of Sector Counter-Terrorism, DG Justice, Freedom and Security, European Commission

**Anthony McGee**, Head of Resilience, Royal United Services Institute, United Kingdom

**Fernando Sanchez Gomez**, Director, National Centre for the Protection of Critical Infrastructures, Ministry of the Interior, Spain

#### Moderator

**Giles Merritt**, Director, Security & Defence Agenda

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



## INTRODUCTION

On 12 May, 2010, The Security and Defence Agenda (SDA) hosted a roundtable entitled ‘Does Europe Need “Homeland Security”?’. This roundtable brought together high-level experts in the field of justice, home affairs and security to consider the difficulties involved in integrating European Union (EU) member states’ internal security policies into a greater European context.

“Until now,” began moderator **Giles Merritt**, Director of the Security and Defence Agenda, “‘Homeland Security’ has been an American term, rather than a European one. The question facing Europe now is whether or not we need to develop something along the same lines as the United States.”

With the adoption in February 2010 of a new internal security strategy, the EU has begun taking steps towards unifying European security, explained keynote speaker **Cecilia Malmström**, European Commissioner for Home Affairs.

“We do not, however, have to copy our friends in the US,” she said. “We are 27 countries that all work slightly differently and we already have mechanisms in place to ensure the EU’s security. What I am doing is to look at how we can further improve relations, including between the existing agencies.”

“The political will to create a unified European approach to security exists to a different extent in different member states,” added **Rafael Fernandez-Pita y Gonzalez**, Deputy Director, DG Justice and Home Affairs, Council of the

EU. “Progress has been made on cooperation between the member states but is now faltering in terms of functional needs.”

Cooperation is the key to internal security, agreed **Rob Wainwright**, Director of Europol. “The Lisbon Treaty provides a unique opportunity to develop one single internal security strategy,” he stated, “but is it moving fast enough?”

“If our current establishments can work together,” Wainwright continued, “we will not need a central agency. Otherwise, our political leaders will have to think of something new.”

Internal security concerns have become unevenly weighted towards terrorist attacks while more practical concerns about critical infrastructure protection (CIP) have been downplayed, said **Anthony McGee**, Head of Resilience, Royal United Services Institute, United Kingdom, during the second session.

“Terror is sexy,” McGee admitted, “speculating about what terrorists might blow up is easy but often relatively useless. The real challenge is much more mundane. It is about gathering the many, many infrastructure stakeholders together and creating frameworks and shared understandings which will help mitigate threats of all kinds.”

“Since 2006,” added **Dick Heimans**, Head of Sector Counter-Terrorism, DG Justice, Freedom and Security, European Commission, “there has been a clear convergence of efforts by the member states towards improving cooperation and streamlining policies in the field of CIP.”



# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



“Research into protecting our critical infrastructures is very important but the solutions found should consider the cost of implementation,” explained **Fernando Sanchez**, Director, National centre for the Protection of Critical Infrastructures, Ministry of the Interior, Spain. “If we are to implement powerful technological solutions to protect critical infrastructures, they must be cost efficient and balanced.”

## KEYNOTE SPEECH - CECILIA MALMSTRÖM

“*Above all, we are increasingly placing the emphasis on prevention. We need to do much more to address the situations of individuals on the margins of our society and to reduce their susceptibility to radicalisation.*”

The new EU internal security strategy, which was agreed upon by the council of home ministers in February 2010, is a crucial first step in protecting the EU and its citizens, began the Commissioner. “This strategy outlines the challenges we face and the guidelines for our response,” she asserted. “It also outlines the principles and values that should guide this work: solidarity, respect for fundamental rights, protection of personal data and the right to privacy.”

Though this strategy is a promising first step, the EU needs to further develop its internal security policies, Malmström explained, suggesting that there are two areas in which EU coordination must move forward.

Firstly, EU member states and security stakeholders must reach a common understanding of the threats facing them. “This might only be a question of rhetoric,” she admitted, “but we in the EU need to agree on a shared, systematic approach to threat assessment. This is impor-

tant if we want to communicate to the citizens what we are doing and why we are doing it.”

Secondly, Malmström explained, “the EU needs an internal security strategy to maximise the impact of its actions. A common strategy will enable us to identify the best ways of dealing with problems while making full use of all the tools at our disposal on the local, regional, national and European levels.”

There is an incongruity between the different levels of European civil and political society when it comes to internal security, she admitted. A more coherent approach from Brussels to the issue will allow the multitude of law enforcement and security agencies to act jointly and in solidarity when one member state suffers a threat to its security.

Indeed, Malmström continued, one of her first tasks was to determine which threats exist. She explained that there are three main areas to which the EU can add strategic and operational value: serious and organised crime; terrorism; and crises or disasters caused by natural or unintended events.

Much of the crime taking place in Europe has its roots in trans-national criminal organisations. These crimes ruin the lives of thousands of EU citizens while also robbing taxpayers and public coffers.

“VAT fraud and the sale of illicit drugs each amount to an estimated 100 billion euros every year. There are already many actions to curtail organised crime within the EU but this is not enough,” she opined. The real challenge is for law enforcement agencies, including customs agencies, to stop crime from entering EU territory.

## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



With over 1600 designated entry points into the EU, integrated border management is the key to reducing and preventing the entry of people and goods which threaten EU security, she told the assembly. “The creation of the border-free area of the EU now extends to 25 countries and is one of our greatest accomplishments,” she proclaimed. “We must work to defend this accomplishment.”

Moving on, Malmström told the roundtable that, according to Europol, there were 294 terrorist attacks in the EU during 2009. This number is a reduction from the previous year but shows that terrorism in all forms still threatens the internal security of the EU.

The EU has criminalised training, recruitment and public provocation to commit terrorist offences, she said. It has taken measures to limit the availability of explosives and dangerous materials as well as to protect critical infrastructures.

“Though important steps have been taken, a lot remains to be done,” she admitted. “Above all, we are increasingly placing the emphasis on prevention. We need to do much more to address the situations of individuals on the margins of our society and to reduce their susceptibility to radicalisation.”

In much the same way, she continued, natural and man-made disasters need to be addressed with a preventative framework. “Very seldom do we see these crises coming,” she explained. “For that reason we must build up our resilience to prevent crises but also to respond to disasters at the time they occur as well as in the long term.”

To this end, the implementation of the solidarity clause in the Lisbon Treaty will emphasise the need both for pre-

paredness and for rapid response in the form of resources and assistance. “We find ourselves today with very incident-driven policies,” she admitted. “We are constantly forced to make quick decisions in order to respond to events and calm the citizenry; decisions which are not always properly thought through.”

In short, she concluded, “We will need to see efforts at both the EU and national levels to address our shared security concerns.” Internal security is a shared responsibility that requires cohesion in policies on police cooperation, criminal justice and border management. It requires better tools, better training, a more efficient exchange of information and better deployment of financial resources, she said.

EU cooperation in this area is still comparatively young, she emphasised. “Most of the work is being done, and should be done, on the national level. The EU institutions now need to discuss how and in which areas they can add value to the individual member states’ policies.”

“The EU’s internal security strategy should not be a stand-alone document,” she insisted. “To remain relevant, it must evolve under constant evaluation.”

Concluding her address, Malmström urged the roundtable to remember that the spirit of the EU was born out of respect for fundamental rights. “Fundamental rights are the compass for the European Commission and the EU as a whole,” she said. “Particularly when it comes to the issues I am dealing with, it is extremely important to not lose sight of this. More than anything, the internal security strategy should help us to personalise the discussion; we need to do more to catch the criminals and to bring them to justice but we also need to do more to protect the rights of our law-abiding citizens.”

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



## SESSION I

### PROSPECTS FOR COOPERATION IN BUILDING A EUROPEAN HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY

“ In order to allow for an informed decision, we must openly encourage discussion and disseminate knowledge. ”

“Very often,” began Wainwright, “great events are required to change the landscape of policy and what political changes member states might accept.” In the case of the US, the events of 9/11 prompted the creation of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), he continued, but with no single event on the scale of 9/11 having occurred in the EU, there is unlikely to be a similar response.

Though terrorist attacks have sped up the development of internal security measures and mechanisms in Europe, this process is still far from complete. In fact, “the political focus on counter-terrorism has actually had negative consequences on EU internal security policy,” Fernandez-Pita explained. Terrorism has monopolised internal security policy and, as a result, less attention is paid to the EU’s reaction to serious and organised crime.

National security has traditionally been defined around intelligence threats such as terrorism, espionage and defence related threats, added Wainwright. While developing supranational security architecture, he continued, “it would be a mistake to not consider the complexity and scale of organised crime and the effects it has on the lives and quality of life of our citizens.”

Organised crime is less visible than terrorism and less politically relevant because it is not politically motivated, elaborated Fernandez-Pita. The public focus on terrorist attacks has also diminished the importance that authorities place on other types of crime that are closer to the citizenry. These crimes are derivative of serious and organised crime and create a sense of insecurity in the population that is not properly addressed.

There is a recognition in Europe that the threat is becoming harder to police and requires a more integrated response, added Wainwright.

“The threats we face from terrorism and organised crime are as complex and as difficult as they ever have been in Europe,” he opined, “and the key question is whether or not we have the framework to respond to these threats.”

### FUNCTIONALITY AND THE CURRENT FRAMEWORK

“ As it stands now, the Council is too rigidly structured, based on the national structures which underpin it. What we need is an EU structure to follow. ”

Adam Isles, Director for Strategy and Policy Consulting, Raytheon, informed by his experiences in the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS), explained that the role of homeland security in the US is to prevent terrorism and organised crime and protect against organisations that operate on a national or supranational level and are thus difficult to combat on the state (or member state) level.

“There are three main factors which should be considered to ensure the practical functionality of internal secu-



## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



“rity architecture,” he continued, “a strong ability to assess risk; the ability to utilise the power of network dynamics; and engaging the public as well as their elected representatives.”

Some might describe the EU intelligence and security community as fractured, Wainwright said, and though the threat and the scale of it now requires a much more integrated response, the EU may not be moving quickly enough in the right direction.

“We need to ask if there are any tools missing from the current paradigm and try to add them,” agreed Commissioner Malmström. “Creating new agencies will not necessarily solve the problem and is likely to cause more problems due to the bureaucracy and institutions involved.”

Pierre Reuland, Special Representative to the EU, International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL), supported Malmström. What is needed is better coordination – through the Standing Committee on Internal Security (COSI) – of the already existing agencies, from Europol to the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC), he said.

“The framework has been created for cooperation on all levels,” agreed Fernandez-Pita, “but we see that functional cooperation does not occur between law enforcement agencies across Europe.”

“There is an underlying problem of multi-disciplinary cooperation on the national level which is shifted onto the management boards of the different agencies,” he continued. “Creating a single agency will not solve this problem.”

“The Lisbon Treaty gives us a unique opportunity to establish for the first time one single internal security strategy and the political structures necessary to develop this strategy,” argued Wainwright. “This is an once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to address this question.”

In the past few months, the roundtable heard, steps have been taken under the Lisbon Treaty to improve the EU’s internal security. “The European Council has agreed on a general internal security strategy and recognised the need for better information exchange and operational cooperation,” assured Fernandez-Pita. “We now have greater coherence in our approach, but it is not yet sufficient.”

“Intelligence sharing is the backbone of any security architecture,” offered Wainwright. “By having all information centrally stored, it allows for a clear understanding of the threat and the ability to prioritise responses and coordinate successful operations.”

What are needed are much greater coordination capabilities that, he continued, would operate through a single hub. “What we have at Europol is a common EU infrastructure to coordinate the collection of all information with regards to terrorism and organised crime,” he continued. “This is not yet an EU Intelligence Agency but it is a far reaching intelligence hub that is not fully exploited.”

This sort of coordination has been essential in the DHS, agreed Isles. “Looking back, we were at our best when we had good common situational awareness and at our worst when we did not. Common situational awareness is more than just an operation centre; it is about not being overwhelmed by the sheer volume of information and understanding needs beforehand, so as to know what the key triggers are, what the full range of responses is and who to depend on.”

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



The DHS' importance to the internal security of the US is greater than the sum of the structures in place, he continued. What is important is that the US has a cross-jurisdictional ability to assess risk, utilise network dynamics and to communicate in a coordinated manner to the public and elected representatives. In gauging the success of the DHS, the EU could do well to take some lessons learned and apply them to its current situation.

“We all have to realise the potential under the Lisbon Treaty and to adopt a common European security model,” concluded Wainwright. “This means much more than a strategy, it is about developing a common methodology of how to respond to threats, how to collect information and what to do with it.”

## A CULTURE OF COOPERATION

//

*If our current establishments can work together, we will not need a central agency. Otherwise, our political leaders will have to think of something new.*

//

Underlining the importance of cooperation in a multi-member security structure, Isles told the roundtable that “an effective internal security mechanism is based on building trust and communication with key stakeholders in advance so you can call on them when you need them.”

“It is essential that we reinforce interdisciplinary coordination starting at the national level and eventually reaching the level of cooperation between member states,” added Fernandez-Pita. “As it stands now, the Council is too rigidly structured based on the national structures which underpin it. What we need is an EU structure to follow.”

A single, well-calibrated structure will lead to a more harmonious approach to security issues in the EU, the roundtable agreed, while also building stronger interdependencies and trust between the EU and national governments.

“In a federal system,” Isles said, “most of the assets in place fall outside of the control of the federal government. So you are relying on states, you are relying on localities and on the private sector for the critical components of your response.”

A common understanding among member states, law enforcement agencies, the EU institutions and the citizenry is essential to developing a coherent and cohesive internal security strategy, the roundtable agreed.

“We need to work to change the culture of cooperation between security organisations so that police and security agencies learn to trust each other and work together,” emphasised Malmström. “Our security organisations should instinctively know to check with Europol and the MIC in order to advance their work.”

In addition to institutional cohesion and increased trust between law enforcement agencies, Isles added, the public must be included in the debate. “It is important for relations with the public to have evaluative measures in place so as to measure the success of key policy decisions,” he said.

While working with the DHS, Isles told the roundtable, much time was spent in discussion with the elected representatives of the Houses of Congress, considering and evaluating the effects of homeland security measures on the privacy and civil liberties of US citizens. He provided the recent example of the inclusion of whole body imag-

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



ing in airport security as an instance where more informed members of Congress voted against party lines in some cases. “In order to allow for an informed decision, we must openly encourage discussion and disseminate knowledge,” he concluded.

“Any police agency’s success must be based on the degree to which it can engender public trust,” Wainwright insisted. Without the fully informed support of the citizens, he continued, there exists the risk of trampling the very rights that homeland security is supposed to protect.

Simply put, the roundtable heard, an informed public should be a prerequisite to developing new internal security strategies. “Public trust is very important at a time when the European Parliament has acquired new competences and new levels of responsibility in the area of internal security,” offered Wainwright. “Stakeholders in European security need to work with parliamentarians and the public in order to convince them that security and justice are two aspects of the same issue.”

“We must be conscious not to strip away fundamental rights while being too security-minded,” explained Fernandez-Pita. A well informed public will help to ensure that the balance between security and fundamental rights is maintained while elected representatives who have the trust of their constituents are likely to be better placed to find the political will needed to recalibrate notions of EU internal security.

## BUILDING POLITICAL CONSENSUS

//

*The biggest political challenge falls on the member states themselves. We can do a lot from Brussels and the institutions to realise the potential outlined by the Lisbon Treaty, but in the end the member states need to consider what opportunities they have and how much of the new architecture they will exploit.*

//

Addressing the assembled participants, Fernandez-Pita wondered if the political will to move forward with an internal security plan exists in the EU. “The political will certainly exists to different extents in different member states,” he answered, “but this political will is more important for creating policies on the national levels rather than on the inter-member state level.”

“The cornerstone of any EU centre would be the extent to which it can provide a secure platform for existing national agencies to integrate,” added Wainwright. This integration, however, is predicated on the member states’ acceptance of the need for an overarching EU strategy, as well as the national governments’ will to push for this integration.

“The biggest political challenge falls on the member states themselves,” Wainwright continued. “We can do a lot from Brussels and the institutions to realise the potential outlined by the Lisbon Treaty, but in the end the member states need to consider what opportunities they have and how much of the new architecture they will exploit.”



# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



“Where we have real clarity of purpose and role, we are more likely to succeed,” he added. “It is for the national governments to realise that solely national solutions are not big enough anymore and that the criminals and terrorists have long since moved past national borders.”

“For us,” concluded Fernandez-Pita, “I do not believe we will, in the short- or medium-term, have homeland security. It will not be created in a big bang; this is not how things are done in the EU. We will go towards it step-by-step, a process that maybe in the future will lead us there. However, taking into account the competences of the member states at the present stage of development, I do not see it in the very near future.”

## SESSION II

### SECURITY & RESILIENCE: THE CASE OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION

//  
*We are not living on islands. No one member state can look after their CI solely by themselves.*

Opening the second session, speaker Dick Heimans offered that, to properly understand the scope of European Critical Infrastructures (CI) one need only look at the energy map of Europe. This map shows the interdependencies between member states as a series of interconnected gas and oil pipelines, hydroelectric projects, and electricity transmission systems which transmit energy all over the EU.

“We are not living on islands,” he commented. “No one member state can look after their CI solely by themselves. When looking at Europe, we can find many ex-

amples of CI which, if damaged or tampered with, could create great problems for several member states.”

“Infrastructure is incredibly important and becoming more and more important all the time,” agreed Anthony McGee. “Protecting it is very challenging; actually reaching to the core of globalisation and the modern challenges we face. Everything is interconnected, with some bits of infrastructure operating with almost no reference to national borders at all, yet we continue to try to provide for these infrastructures from a national viewpoint.”

“CI have never been so crucial to the functioning of essential public services and major production systems as they are now,” added Fernando Sanchez. Faced with this, CIP is an essential element of the concept of EU homeland security. However, he continued, this fact should not necessarily mean that the internal security of the EU trumps the national sovereignty of its member states.

The delicate and intertwined nature of CI in Europe is the basis for CIP, said Heimans, explaining that it was not until the 2004 attack on the Madrid Metro that the European Council decided that there should be a European program to develop ways to protect CI.

### WHAT IS CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE?

//  
*The basic definition of European CI is any infrastructure whose destruction or disruption would have a significant effect on 2 or more member states.*

//  
In December 2008, Heimans explained, there was a Commission directive adopted that set out a process for the identification and designation of European CI. “The



## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



basic definition of European CI is any infrastructure whose destruction or disruption would have a significant effect on 2 or more member states,” he told the assembly.

In the directive, this basic definition is supplemented by other cross-cutting and sector-specific criteria to determine if the infrastructure is indeed critical for Europe: number of casualties, economic considerations, and public effects on morale, amongst others.

Speaking for the Spanish National Centre for the Protection of Critical Infrastructures, Sanchez offered a slightly more pragmatic definition to complement his fellow speaker's. “The primary concept is not the infrastructure itself but the role it plays and the services it provides,” he explained. “Infrastructures can therefore be considered to be critical if they provide these essential services.”

CIP, continued Sanchez, is a very difficult matter. It is very diverse, covering many different sectors. Even these sectors are ill-defined; for example, the EU claims 11 sectors as critical, while Spain counts 12. “There is no human activity in our world that is not linked to, or dependent on, strategic sectors in one way or another,” he admonished, “and one of the main mistakes we are all making is that everything is being referred to as critical infrastructure.”

The lack of a clear definition should not be considered a negative thing, insisted Heimans. The designation process as set out in the abovementioned Commission directive obliges member states to discuss and cooperate with one another before their shared infrastructure is named critical.

“If one member state thinks that their infrastructure affects others,” he explained, “there must be a dialogue between these member states, resulting in the designation of European CI. Immediately, we have created a dynamic where we have to start trusting each other when it comes to discussing very sensitive issues related to national CI.”

Once an infrastructure is designated CI, there are two immediate consequences. Firstly, the operator of the CI needs to provide an operator security plan and secondly, a security liaison officer is assigned to the infrastructure in order to deal with authorities and maintain quick and open lines of communication.

Currently, Heimans added, the directive only considers energy and transport infrastructures in its designation process but, following a review slated for 2012, it is expected that other sectors will be added, including ICT, and banking.

Another important tool for the development of European CIP is the recently launched Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN), continued Heimans, which is now in its pilot phase. It allows the member states to cooperate and exchange information about the designation process, about national policies, about the research they are doing, about the interdependencies they are looking at, and many other topics of interest.

“Since 2006,” he concluded, “there has been a clear convergence of efforts by member states towards having established policies, improving cooperation and streamlining efforts.”

# Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



## WHAT IS THE DANGER?

//

*It has become clear over the last decade that terrorism is by no means the biggest threat to CI and terrorism should by no means be the single biggest driver of CIP.*

//

When it comes to protecting European CI, “we are collectively reliving the experiences of individual member states,” suggested McGee. The United Kingdom has had a long experience with terrorism and, as a result, “have become very good at protective security. The UK Centre for the Protection of Critical Infrastructure (CPNI) is, by common consent, among the best in the world on these issues”.

“Of course, it is clear that terrorism is the main threat we are facing,” proclaimed Sanchez. “For better or worse,” he added, “many CI are high-profile targets, tempting targets which, if damaged or destroyed, would disrupt the daily lives of citizens.”

“Memory is short,” Sanchez opined, “we might be horribly impacted by attacks on citizens but weeks later, life goes on.” Conversely, if there is an attack on CI which causes a disruption in daily life, the public’s reaction is unpredictable but is likely to be negatively directed towards the government that cannot quickly resume services.

Disagreeing with his fellow discussant, McGee told the roundtable that “it has become clear over the last decade that terrorism is by no means the biggest threat to CI and terrorism should by no means be the single biggest driver of CIP.”

McGee offered two examples in the UK of more pressing issues to CIP. In the last ten years, he said, the UK has suffered frequent bouts of flooding. In these cases, it was not the initial weather event which caused the most damage but the damage to infrastructure and the subsequent difficulties involved in resuming services and transporting goods.

It is projected that as climate change continues to occur, the probability of increased severe weather events poses a greater threat to CI than terrorist attacks, he opined.

A second great risk to CI in the UK is the privatisation of UK infrastructures which has occurred during the last decades. In a privatised system, regulatory bodies become single-mindedly focused on lowering the cost of goods and services to the consumer.

Furthermore, regulators rarely look outside their own sector and take no account of resilience. As the UK has increased CIP, there has been a systematic hollowing out of resilience capabilities. Both of these scenarios pose a larger threat to the continued protection of CI in the UK, McGee asserted.

Most of the CI in Europe is owned and operated by private means, admitted Sanchez. This fact reinforces the need for a comprehensive approach to CIP. A possible solution to the problem of privatisation, he continued, would be to bring the operation of systems that provide essential services under the umbrella of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP). This could serve to increase the security and safe operation of CI but would certainly bring the debate over the cost of securing these infrastructures into the public sphere.

## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



### SECURITY RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND THE COST OF CIP

//  
*Research into protecting our critical infrastructures is very important but the solutions found should consider the cost of implementation. If we are to implement powerful technological solutions to protect critical infrastructures, they must be cost efficient and balanced.*

//  
One of the most divisive aspects of CIP policy is its cost, Heimans told the roundtable. It can be difficult to justify pouring millions, even billions, of euros into the various aspects of security research and technology, including production and implementation, as there is no sure way to determine the effectiveness of these costly measures.

“Looking at the larger context of CIP, the outlook is bleak,” admitted McGee. “Infrastructure is becoming almost impossibly interdependent and complex. Infrastructure investment was described as a global crisis at the World Economic Forum in Davos where it was estimated that there is 32 trillion US dollars (37 billion euros) of investment needed to keep global infrastructure operating properly until 2020. In the current global economic climate, no one has any idea where that money will come from.”

In order to respect this funding deficit, it is imperative to find security solutions that are cost efficient and balanced, Sanchez responded. “If we are to implement a powerful technological solution to protect an entire pipeline, for example, the cost is likely to be unrealistically high. We must consider the cost of implementation and scale our solutions accordingly.”

While on the one hand, security technology seems to require a nearly bottomless purse, it may hold the key to cost effective, sustainable and secure infrastructures if developed properly, insisted McGee. “Technology is the ace up our sleeve,” he commented. “The UK Government Office for Science has produced a report on the rise of intelligent infrastructure systems which depend on relatively cheap and effective nanotechnology to maintain their functionality.” This sort of intelligent approach to intelligent design may represent a new direction for CIP in the EU.

Security research and technology could benefit from the cost-saving opportunities which an integrated EU approach to CIP could provide, Heimans offered. There is a lot of money being spent on security research currently in the EU – 1.4 billion euros for the 2007-2013 budgetary period.

The European Commission has initiated a project which is run by its joint research centre in Ispra, Italy with the goal of organising a network of labs to test security technology and develop a standardised rating system throughout the EU. “New security technology often has to pass several national standards tests,” Heimans explained.

“What we are trying to do is set up a system to foster trust between testing authorities in the member states, so that testing only has to happen once,” he continued. “Another benefit of this network of labs will be an overall increase in the quality of EU security technology.”

Much work remains to be done on developing an integrated EU approach to CIP, though the agencies and mechanisms which can accomplish this already exist, the roundtable agreed.

## Does Europe need “Homeland Security”?



“It is not time to create a new coordinating agency,” emphasised Sanchez, “EU homeland security, including CIP, should be addressed by pre-existing agencies and coordinated among them. All European countries are doing their homework when it comes to CIP and, though the Commission’s process is at this point still basic, it is a strong beginning. The road ahead is long but we have taken promising first steps.”



# List of Participants

**Sharon Abbas**

European Union Account Manager  
Raytheon International, Europe

**Yolanda Alonso**

Delegation of the Basque Country to the EU

**Darko Arabadzic**

Second Secretary  
Mission of Croatia to the EU

**Amaia Ayala**

EU Officer Assistant  
Delegation of the Basque Country to the EU

**Paul Baes**

former Official, Council of the European Union

**Martin Banks**

Journalist  
The Parliament Magazine, DODS EU

**Francisco Bataller Martin**

Deputy Head of Unit, Coordination and Analysis  
Directorate General for External Relations  
European Commission

**Jacquelyn Bednarz**

Attaché, Department of Homeland Security  
Mission of the United States of America to the EU

**Annie Bollaert**

Programme and Information Officer, Political  
Section  
Mission of Canada to the EU

**Christian Boone**

Member  
Association for Intercultural Education

**Jakub Boratynski**

Head of Unit, Fight against organised crime  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Cindy Bouchard**

First Secretary, Border Services  
Mission of Canada to the EU

**Hugo Brady**

Research Fellow  
Centre for European Reform (CER)

**Kathryn Buer**

Business Development, Intelligence & Information  
Systems  
Raytheon International, Europe

**Veronica Bustamante**

Point of Contact, Spanish Presidency of the EU  
EU Joint Situation Centre  
Council of the European Union

**Leo Buzzerio**

Assistant Army Attache  
Embassy of the United States of America to  
Belgium

**Geert Cami**

Co-Founder & Director  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Gabriela Caraman**

External Consultant  
LOGOS Public Affairs

**Mirko Cigler**

Minister Plenipotentiary, PSC Ambassador  
Permanent Representation of Slovenia to the EU

**Gintaras Čiurlionis**

Minister Counsellor  
Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU

# List of Participants

**Giovanni Colombo**

Consultant  
Hill & Knowlton International Belgium

**Javier Corrales Ciganda**

Director  
Union de Pequenos Agricultores y Ganaderos

**Robert Cox**

Trustee  
Friends of Europe

**Benoit Cusin**

Journalist  
Agence Europe

**Oliver Dahms**

Armaments Counsellor  
Permanent Representation of Germany to the EU

**Stanislav Daskalov**

Head of Brussels Liaison Office  
Brussels Liaison Office  
Regional Cooperation Council

**Christian D'Cunha**

Policy Officer - Police co-operation  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security  
European Commission

**Gilles de Kerchove d'Ousselghem**

Counter-terrorism Coordinator  
General Secretariat  
Council of the European Union

**Danny de Temmerman**

Desk Officer, Fight against Economic, Financial and Cyber Crime  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and Security  
European Commission

**Joan Delaney**

Independent Consultant

**Ward Dendievel**

President  
MUN Society Belgium

**John Derrick**

Second Secretary, Counter-terrorism, Drugs, Civil Protection and External JHA  
Permanent Representation of the United Kingdom to the EU

**Eva Diaz Perez**

DS Key Account NATO/EU  
European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS)

**Anatoly Didenko**

Counsellor, Home Affairs  
Mission of the Russian Federation to the EU

**Michael T. Dougherty**

Director of Immigration Control  
Raytheon

**Robert Draper**

President  
AeroStrategies

**Marianne Ebertowski**

Director Common Foreign and Security Policy  
Heinrich Böll Stiftung

**Radka Edererova**

Counsellor  
Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic to the EU

**Joakim Ekström**

Security Manager  
AeroSpace and Defence Industries Association of Europe (ASD)

# List of Participants

**Elina Eloranta**

Executive Secretary  
Church and Society Commission of the  
Conference of European Churches

**Patsy Faynsztein**

Manager, EU Business Development  
Raytheon International, Europe

**Rafael Fernandez-Pita y Gonzalez**

Deputy Director General  
Directorate General for Justice & Home Affairs  
Council of the European Union

**Andrea Filipova**

Officer - Relations with the EU Institutions  
EU Office  
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

**Octavia Frota**

Senior Advisor  
Conrad International

**Damian Gadzinowski**

Policy Officer  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Hugo Ganet-Sénoko**

Programme Manager  
European Organisation for Security (EOS)

**Igor Garcia-Tapia**

Project Assistant  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Eugenia Garrisi**

Graduate Student  
Boston University

**Elisa Gastaldi**

Intern  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Andrea Ghianda**

Project Coordinator  
European Security Round Table

**Bill Giles**

Director General Europe  
BAE Systems

**Laurent Giquello**

French National Expert  
NATO - Air Command and Control System  
Management Agency (NACMA)

**Ioana-Maria Gligor**

Translator  
Directorate General for Translation  
European Commission

**Carmen Godeanu**

Relations with the EU Institutions  
EU Office  
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

**Jesper Gronvall**

Special Advisor for Homeland Security  
Embassy of Sweden to the US

**Anna Halldén**

Research Coordinator  
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)

**Edward Hanlon**

President, Europe  
Raytheon International, Europe

# List of Participants

**Robin Healey**

First Secretary, Justice and Home Affairs  
Permanent Representation of the United Kingdom  
to the EU

**Dick Heimans**

Head of Sector, Counter-terrorism  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Marco Hekkens**

Deputy Commander/Commander Landing Force  
Netherlands Maritime Force (NLMARFOR)

**Jessica Henderson**

Senior Account Manager  
Fleishman-Hillard

**Arnauld Hibon**

Eurocopter Vice President & Director for EU  
Relations  
European Aeronautic Defence and Space  
Company (EADS)

**Anna Hjorth**

Reporter  
Polistidningen

**Henna Hopia**

Brussels Correspondent  
Nykypäivä

**Bjoern Hultin**

Managing Director  
Intercity Consulting

**Adam Isles**

Homeland Security Director  
Raytheon

**Andrea Walter Isoldo**

Junior Assistant  
Finmeccanica

**Dilek Istar Ates**

Advisor  
Turkish Industry and Business Association  
(TUSIAD)

**Ivana Jemelkova**

Research Fellow  
Association for International Affairs

**Ana Cristina Jorge**

Liaison Officer  
European Agency for the Management of  
Operational Cooperation at the External Borders  
(FRONTEX)

**Janos Kendernay**

Political Advisor, Kinga Gál MEP  
European Parliament

**Galina Khorkova**

Researcher  
Brussels School of International Studies  
University of Kent

**Lina Kolesnikova**

Advisory Board  
Crisis Response Journal

**Jean Labrique**

Secretary General  
Western Defence Studies Institute

**Yves Lagoude**

European Affairs Director, Thales Security  
Solutions and Services  
Thales

**Brice Lançon**

Director, European Affairs, Space, Security &  
Defence  
Safran Group



# List of Participants

**Marc Le Noir**

Business Solution Professional Public Sector  
BeNeLux  
IBM Belgium

**Sidney Leclercq**

Researcher  
Facultés Universitaires St Louis  
Groupe de recherche en appui aux politiques de  
paix (Grapax)

**Toni Lepone**

Director, International Marketing Communications  
Raytheon

**Liebrecht Lierman**

Intern, Benelux desk  
United Nations Regional Information Center for  
Western Europe (UNRIC)

**Gitte Lindgaard**

Intern  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Vesna Ljungquist**

Official  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Luigi Longoni**

Vice President  
Business Development & Institutional Customers  
Thales Alenia Space

**Valeria Lunadei**

NAGSMO BOD Head Permanent Secretariat  
NATO Headquarters (HQ)  
North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

**James Kevin MacGoris**

Head of Communications  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Jacques Malache**

Senior Director  
International Press Agency

**Cecilia Malmström**

Commissioner for Home Affairs  
European Commission

**Boris Manev**

Student; Environment, Energy and Resource  
Management Program  
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

**Bruno Martins**

PhD candidate  
University of Minho

**Pauline Massart**

Senior Manager  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Zurab Matcharadze**

European Correspondent  
Resonance Daily Newspaper

**Anthony McGee**

Head of Resilience  
Royal United Services Institute for Defence and  
Security Studies (RUSI)

**Daniela Meissner**

Legal Advisor, Programme Manager  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Giles Merritt**

Director  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Joseph Militano**

Vice President, International Communications  
Raytheon

# List of Participants

**Harris Minas**

Intelligence Analyst  
Sandstone S.A.

**Robin Poupelle**

Director, Brussels Office  
Go Green

**Annalisa Monaco**

Director EU and NATO Relations  
The Boeing Company

**Constantinos Prevelakis**

Independent Consultant

**Valentina Morselli**

PhD Student  
Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB)

**Rudy Priem**

Senior Government Affairs Manager for Security  
and Defense, Europe  
United Technologies Corporation (UTC)

**Sinan Mueller-Karpe**

Co-Founder  
Nachrichtendienst-Forschung

**Rebecca Pugh**

Co-desk, USA, Canada  
Directorate General for External Relations  
European Commission

**Reginald Otten**

Account Director  
Fleishman-Hillard

**Pierre Reuland**

Special Representative of Interpol to the EU  
International Criminal Police Organization  
(INTERPOL)

**Alena Pejcochova**

Junior Legal Researcher  
Inter-University Chair in Law and the Human  
Genome  
University of Deusto

**Tamar Ribashvily**

ENP Desk Officer  
Mission of Israel to the EU

**Anabela Pereira**

Coordinator for Internal Communication  
Directorate General for Translation  
European Commission

**Wolfgang Rudischhauser**

Counsellor, Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, EU-  
UN Relations  
Permanent Representation of Germany to the EU

**Gotellenne Piaton**

Chargée de mission "Think Tanks", Service de  
Presse et Information  
Permanent Representation of France to the EU

**Arkadiusz Rzepka**

PhD student  
European University Viadrina

**Sara Pini**

Head of Office  
Fondation Robert Schuman

**Hilde Sagon**

Legal Advisor  
EU Liaison Office  
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

**Romain Poly**

European Affairs Manager  
Thales

# List of Participants

**Fernando Sanchez Gomez**

Director  
National Centre for the Protection of Critical Infrastructures (CNPIC)  
Ministry of the Interior, Spain

**Moureen Schobert**

Project Manager  
European Organisation for Security (EOS)

**Teri Schultz**

Freelance Journalist  
National Public Radio (NPR)

**Audrey Scozzaro Ferrazzini**

Government Relations Manager  
Research in Motion

**Dorothy Seed**

Head of Communications  
Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI)  
Home Office, United Kingdom

**Aldo Siragusa**

Honorary Head of Division  
Council of the European Union

**Zeka Sizo**

Administrateur Délégué  
Les Amis du Monde Entier

**Christian Sommade**

Délégué General  
Haut Comité Français pour la Défense Civile (HCFDC)

**Philip Springuel**

Communications and Business Development Manager  
European Food Information Council (EUFIC)

**Antonia-Denisa Staedel**

PhD Student  
University of Erlangen-Nuremberg

**Carl- Einar Stålvant**

Course Director  
Swedish National Defence College (SNDC)

**Michael Stopford**

Deputy Assistant Secretary General, Strategic Communications Services (SCS)  
Public Diplomacy Division  
North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

**Ask Eirik Storsve**

Consultant  
EUK Consulting

**Olivia ten Horn**

Project Assistant  
Security & Defence Agenda (SDA)

**Girma Asmerom Tesfay**

Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,  
Head of Mission  
Mission of Eritrea to the EU

**Brooks Tigner**

EU/NATO Affairs Correspondent  
Jane's Defence Weekly

**Janos Tisovszky**

Deputy Director  
United Nations Regional Information Center for Western Europe (UNRIC)

**Mascia Toussaint**

Director  
OCMC European Affairs

**Michel Troubetzkoy**

Senior Vice President, Director for EU & NATO Affairs  
EADS Astrium

**Gülsah Tüfekci**

Assistant to Alexander Alvaro, MEP  
European Parliament

# List of Participants

**Deniz Turgay**

Intern  
Turkish Industry and Business Association  
(TUSIAD)

**Arian Turhani**

EU Account Executive, Global Public Sector  
Unisys

**Ann Vanhout**

Policy Co-ordinator - Horizontal Drugs Co-ordinator  
Directorate General for External Relations  
European Commission:

**Henrik Vassallo**

Advisor, EU Affairs & NATO  
SAAB

**Otto Vermeulen**

Partner  
PricewaterhouseCoopers

**Peter von Bethlenfalvy**

Executive Director  
Centre for European and International Policy  
Action (CEIPA)

**Jelena Von Helldorff**

Vice-President  
Institute for International Assistance and Solidarity  
(IFIAS)

**Josepha von Metternich**

Director  
The Movement for Free Movement  
Kangaroo Group

**Kostyantyn Voytovsky**

Counsellor, Defence Intelligence  
Mission of Ukraine to NATO

**Anna Vvdenskaya**

Journalist, EU and NATO Observer  
BBC Russian Service

**Rob Wainwright**

Director  
European Police Office

**Robert Watters**

Partner  
Synopta

**Britney Wehrfritz**

Communication and Project Manager  
European Citizen Action Service (ECAS)

**Karin Wenander**

Special Advisor  
National Police Board

**Gunnar Wiegand**

Representative of the Interior Ministry  
Representation of the Free State of Bavaria to the  
European Union

**Paula Wieggers**

Policy Officer, Counter-Terrorism  
Directorate General for Justice, Freedom and  
Security  
European Commission

**Erik Windmar**

Personal Assistant to EU Commissioner for Home  
Affairs Cecilia Malmström  
European Commission

**Lorenzo Zito**

Brussels Office  
Finmeccanica

**Filip Zoń**

Head of the Office  
Malopolska Region Brussels Office





The Security & Defence Agenda (SDA) is the only specialist Brussels-based think-tank where EU institutions, NATO, national governments, industry, specialised and international media, think tanks, academia and NGOs gather to discuss the future of European and transatlantic security and defence policies in Europe and worldwide.

---

Building on the combined expertise and authority of those involved in our meetings, the SDA gives greater prominence to the complex questions of how EU and NATO policies can complement one another, and how transatlantic challenges such as terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction can be met.

By offering a high-level and neutral platform for debate, the SDA sets out to clarify policy positions, stimulate discussion and ensure a wider understanding of defence and security issues by the press and public opinion.

SDA Activities:

- Monthly Roundtables and Evening debates
- Press Dinners and Lunches
- International Conferences
- Discussion Papers and special events

# NATO's European Dimension

Brussels - 21 June, 2010

The Security & Defence Agenda will host an international conference entitled **NATO's European Dimension**, in Brussels on the 21st of June, 2010. The event will bring together key European and NATO policymakers in an effort to debate the options for the alliance's future. The conference will also include a discussion on the **10 recommendations from the SDA's global Security Jam session** an online debate held in February 2010, which featured the input of 4,000 experts from 124 countries.

NATO is intent on reinventing itself, but with a global trend of defence cuts and European withdrawals from operations in Afghanistan, the future of the organisation will depend on its ability to adapt to a new strategic environment. In this context, **Anders Fogh Rasmussen**, Secretary General of NATO, will present his ideas in a keynote address entitled, "*Security in an Era of Budgetary Scarcity*".

## Confirmed speakers include:

- § **Robert Bell**, Secretary of Defense Representative to Europe and Defense Advisor, US Mission to the EU
- § **Jeffrey Bialos**, Executive Director of the Program on Transatlantic Security and Industry, Center for Transatlantic Relations
- § **Robert Cooper**, Director-General for External and Politico-Military Affairs, Council of the European Union,
- § **Luis Manuel Cuesta Civis**, Secretary General of the Spanish Ministry of Defence,
- § **Kai Eide**, former UN Special Representative to Afghanistan.
- § **Richard Froh**, Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Armaments, NATO
- § **Imants Liegis**, Minister of Defence, Republic of Latvia,
- § **General John McColl**, Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe of NATO,
- § **David O'Sullivan**, Director General of DG Trade at the European Commission,
- § **Dmitry Rogozin**, Head of Mission, Mission of the Russia to NATO





The Security & Defence Agenda (SDA) would like to thank its members and partners for their support.



The SDA gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the following governments:

Belgium | Czech Republic | Finland | France | Italy | Netherlands  
Romania | Russia | Turkey | United States

For further information on SDA membership, contact us at:

Tel: +32 (0)2 739 1582 | Email: [info@securitydefenceagenda.org](mailto:info@securitydefenceagenda.org)

## **SECURITY & DEFENCE AGENDA (SDA)**

Bibliothèque Solvay, Parc Léopold, 137 rue Belliard, B-1040, Brussels, Belgium  
Tel: +32 (0)2 737 91 48 Fax: +32 (0)2 736 32 16 E-mail: [info@securitydefenceagenda.org](mailto:info@securitydefenceagenda.org)  
[www.securitydefenceagenda.org](http://www.securitydefenceagenda.org)