THEME [SEC-2011.6.1-1]
[Analysis of the security systems in Europe]

Grant agreement for: Coordination and support action[*]

Annex I - "Description of Work"

Project acronym: ANVIL

Project full title: " Analysis of Civil Security Systems in Europe "

Grant agreement no: 284678

Version date: 2011-10-19

Table of Contents

Part A

Workplan Tables

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

One form per project

General information

Project title [3]	Analysis of Civil Security Systems in Europe
Starting date [4]	The first day of the month after the signature by the Commission
Duration in months [5]	24
Call (part) identifier [6]	FP7-SEC-2011-1
Activity code(s) most relevant to your topic [7]	SEC-2011.6.1-1: Analysis of the security systems in Europe		
Free keywords [8]		Mapping, Regional, Security Architecture	

Abstract [9]

Our objective in this project is to explore and compare relevant cultural phenomena and legal determinations of civil security across Europe, taking into account the existing significant differences between countries and regions. We start by creating a framework that can be used to carry out a comparative analysis. We develop definitions of security effectiveness and efficiency that can be put into practice with the available data and in the context of the widely varying security systems in Europe. We consider a representative sample of selected countries, embodying the diverse regional security architectures, with regard to the sharing of responsibilities between public and private bodies and the role that citizens and their awareness play in regional security architectures. We study how the identified differences affect the effectiveness and efficiency of different kinds of security systems in these countries and regions. We determine what works and what doesn't work with regard to particular types of risks, crises and disasters, and countries and regions. Finally we give specific advice, based on consensually agreed upon objective indicators and analysis, about what changes or modifications might result in improvements to the security situation in regions or countries where this is desired by EU policymakers. Consequently, we achieve the expected impact of giving the EU a clear view of which kind of systems that could successfully enhance the security in certain regions, and contribute and give EU-added value to the debate concerning "not one security fits all".

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

List of Beneficiaries

No	Name	Short name	Country	Project entry month[10]	Project exit month
1	Research Management AS	Resman	Norway	1	24
2	UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT	UTRECHT	Netherlands	1	24
3	IDEELLA FORENINGAR UTRIKESPOLITISKAINSTITUTET, INFORMATIONSAVD	UI	Sweden	1	24
4	UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX	UEssex	United Kingdom	1	24
5	INSTITUT ZA MEDUNARODNE ODNOSE	IMO	Croatia	1	24
6	HELLENBERG INTERNATIONAL OY	HI	Finland	1	24
7	ISTITUTO AFFARI INTERNAZIONALI	I.A.I.	Italy	1	24
8	INSTITUT FUR FRIEDENSFORSCHUNG UND SICHERHEITSPOLITIK AN DER UNIVERSITAT HAMBURG	IFSH	Germany	1	24
9	Försvarshögskolan, Swedish National Defence College	SNDC	Sweden	1	24
10	UNIVERISTET U BEOGRADU,FAKULTET BEZBEDNOSTI	FB	Serbia	1	24
11	FONDATION POUR LA RECHERCHE STRATEGIQUE	FRS	France	1	24
12	UNIWERSYTET IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU	AMU	Poland	1	24

A3:
Budget Breakdown

Project Number [1]	284678		Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Participant number in this project [11]	Participant short name	Ind. costs[13]	Estimated eligible costs (whole duration of the project)				Total receipts	Requested EU contribution
			Coordination / Support (A)	Management (B)	Other (C)	Total A+B+C		
1	Resman	A	161,422.00	215,890.00	38,720.00	416,032.00	0.00	404,793.00
2	UTRECHT	A	234,199.00	6,500.00	1,200.00	241,899.00	0.00	216,397.00
3	UI	T	181,112.40	1,875.00	1,440.00	184,427.40	0.00	164,650.00
4	UEssex	T	234,871.20	875.00	0.00	235,746.20	0.00	210,301.00
5	IMO	T	77,125.20	0.00	0.00	77,125.20	0.00	68,769.00
6	HI	T	216,589.20	0.00	0.00	216,589.20	0.00	193,125.00
7	I.A.I.	T	220,626.00	1,400.00	0.00	222,026.00	0.00	198,124.00
8	IFSH	T	159,448.80	1,400.00	0.00	160,848.80	0.00	143,575.00
9	SNDC	A	146,492.00	0.00	0.00	146,492.00	0.00	130,622.00
10	FB	T	68,728.80	0.00	0.00	68,728.80	0.00	61,283.00
11	FRS	T	142,988.40	0.00	0.00	142,988.40	0.00	127,497.00
12	AMU	T	101,037.60	0.00	0.00	101,037.60	0.00	90,091.00
Total			1,944,640.60	227,940.00	41,360.00	2,213,940.60	0.00	2,009,227.00

Note that the budget mentioned in this table is the total budget requested by the Beneficiary and associated Third Parties.

* The following funding schemes are distinguished

Collaborative Project (if a distinction is made in the call please state which type of Collaborative project is referred to: (i) Small of medium-scale focused research project, (ii) Large-scale integrating project, (iii) Project targeted to special groups such as SMEs and other smaller actors), Network of Excellence, Coordination Action, Support Action.

1. Project number

The project number has been assigned by the Commission as the unique identifier for your project, and it cannot be changed. The project number **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents** to prevent errors during its handling.

2. Project acronym

Use the project acronym as indicated in the submitted proposal. It cannot be changed, unless agreed during the negotiations. The same acronym **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents** to prevent errors during its handling.

3. Project title

Use the title (preferably no longer than 200 characters) as indicated in the submitted proposal. Minor corrections are possible if agreed during the preparation of the grant agreement.

4. Starting date

Unless a specific (fixed) starting date is duly justified and agreed upon during the preparation of the Grant Agreement, the project will start on the first day of the month following the entry info force of the Grant Agreement (NB : entry into force = signature by the Commission). Please note that if a fixed starting date is used, you will be required to provide a detailed justification on a separate note.

5. Duration

Insert the duration of the project in full months.

6. Call (part) identifier

The Call (part) identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you were addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union. You have to use the identifier given by the Commission in the letter inviting to prepare the grant agreement.

7. Activity code

Select the activity code from the drop-down menu.

8. Free keywords

Use the free keywords from your original proposal; changes and additions are possible.

9. Abstract

10. The month at which the participant joined the consortium, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

11. The number allocated by the Consortium to the participant for this project.

12. Include the funding % for RTD/Innovation – either 50% or 75%

13. Indirect cost model
   A: Actual Costs
   S: Actual Costs Simplified Method
   T: Transitional Flat rate
   F :Flat Rate

Workplan Tables

Project number

284678

Project title

ANVIL—Analysis of Civil Security Systems in Europe

Call (part) identifier

FP7-SEC-2011-1

Funding scheme

Coordination and support action

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

LIST OF WORK PACKAGES (WP)						
WP Number [53]	WP Title	Type of activity [54]	Lead beneficiary number [55]	Person-months [56]	Start month [57]	End month [58]
WP 1	Establishing a framework for data collection and analysis	SUPP	2	27.00	1	12
WP 2	Mapping civil security systems in European countries	SUPP	3	103.00	4	18
WP 3	Mapping regional security associations	SUPP	7	53.00	6	18
WP 4	Comparing and assessing civil security systems	SUPP	8	50.00	10	24
WP 5	Ensuring EU added-value for policy stakeholders	SUPP	4	35.00	2	24
WP 6	Dissemination and exploitation	SUPP	1	28.00	1	24
WP 7	Management	MGT	1	17.00	1	24
			Total	313.00		

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

List of Deliverables - to be submitted for review to EC

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	WP number [53]	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D1.1	Analysis framework	1	2	27.00	R	PU	12
D2.1	Compilation of country studies	2	3	103.00	R	PU	18
D3.1	Mapping regional associations	3	7	53.00	R	PU	18
D4.1	Synthesis report on comparison of civil security systems	4	8	25.00	R	PU	20
D4.2	Final analytical report on comparison of civil security systems	4	8	25.00	R	PU	24
D5.1	Report on EU-added value for policy stakeholders	5	4	35.00	R	PU	24
D6.1	Project dissemination report	6	1	26.00	R	PU	20
D6.2	Dissemination and exploitation plan	6	1	2.00	R	PU	24
D7.1	Kick-off meeting report	7	1	1.00	R	RE	2
D7.2	Interim report 1	7	1	2.00	R	RE	7
D7.3	Interim report 2	7	1	3.00	R	RE	19
D7.4	Personal data use authorizations	7	1	1.00	R	RE	4
D7.5	Report on ethical issues	7	1	2.00	R	RE	21
			Total	305.00			

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Work package number [53]	WP1	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Establishing a framework for data collection and analysis		
Start month	1		
End month	12		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	2		

Objectives

-To design the framework for data collection and analysis.

Description of work and role of partners

Task 1.1: Defining the relevant features to be studied in each system to ensure a strong analytical foundation for the project. This task involves bringing together expertise from academia, research institutions, the private sector, and public bodies to operationalize the four dimensions described above: cultural/historical features, legal/constitutional features, relations with citizens, and public-private constellations.

Task 1.2: Identification of key informants for the WP1 work. Each consortium partner will be asked to identify specific sources of information (defined in task 1.1) as well as a strategy for getting the required data. Key informants can typically be identified through previous relevant contacts in a country, through literature and web searches, and through networking to establish new contacts. Furthermore, key informants can be involved in the project by taking direct contact as appropriate, and following up with key informants that are willing to contribute.

Task 1.3: Defining the meaning "effectiveness" and "efficiency" in a civil security context. This step contributes to the normative foundation for the project, allowing the consortium to evaluate which features contribute to effectiveness and efficiency. It requires drawing heavily upon the large body of academic literature on the effectiveness and efficiency of comparable public administration systems. These findings should be "translated" to study of systems designed for coping with crises and disasters. As there is no consensus on what we may expect from these systems, and how much we should be willing to pay for it, answering this question involves a normative discussion in which practitioners from national, regional and European levels should play a major part. Activities will include the following:
• Overview general literature on quality of public systems
• Translation into concepts and indicators of crisis and disaster management systems
• Survey among experts
• Workshop with experts in public administration and crisis management

Each partner except Resman allotted 1 PM for participation in Tasks 1.1, 1.2, 1.3; UI, UEssex and HI allotted an extra 3 PM for more in depth contribution to Task 1.2 and 1.3; UTRECHT allotted an extra 8 PMs for leading WP1.

Resman's role: Assist in ensuring that the WP1 objectives are met and that the deliverables are of high quality and in accordance with the overall scope and required impact of the project. Also, Resman will organize the workshop, which will occur in conjunction with the second consortium meeting at month 6.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	2.00
2	UTRECHT	9.00

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
3	UI	4.00
4	UEssex	4.00
5	IMO	1.00
6	HI	1.00
7	I.A.I.	1.00
8	IFSH	1.00
9	SNDC	1.00
10	FB	1.00
11	FRS	1.00
12	AMU	1.00
	Total	27.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D1.1	Analysis framework	2	27.00	R	PU	12
			Total	27.00		

Description of deliverables

D1.1) Analysis framework: A handbook (manual) on essential features and key indicators of civil security systems, clearly defining each feature and indicator, and explaining how to identify and collect information on these in practice. This "methodology" provides a set of empirical indicators to facilitate comparison, and will be useful to both practitioners and to scholars. In addition, these findings will be validated by a board of crisis management and public administration experts. All this will result in a validated assessment method of the efficiency and effectiveness of civil security systems. (Interim (draft) Deliverable d1.1a at month 6; Final Deliverable 1.1 at month 12). [month 12]

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS2	Key WP1 study features identified	2	2	confirmed in interim report 1
MS3	Key WP1 informants identified	2	3	confirmed in interim report 1
MS6	WP1.3 workshop held	1	6	confirmed in interim report 1

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

One form per Work Package			

Work package number [53]	WP2	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Mapping civil security systems in European countries		
Start month	4		
End month	18		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	3		

Objectives

-To map the security systems in a representative group of European countries.

Description of work and role of partners

This Work Package supervises the collection of data on civil security systems in Europe, according to the analytical framework devised in WP1. Each partner will be asked to study a selection of countries within a particular region (a task with which all partners have experience) using the dimensions outlined in the analytical framework (the cultural context of the system, the legal/constitutional context of the system, its relations to citizens and stakeholders, and the role of the private sector)

This WP will oversee the mapping of EU member state systems in a variety of sub-European regions, and will include some EU accession states because of their emerging role in the European civil security landscape. Preliminary plans are to focus on the Nordic countries (Sweden, Finland), the British Isles (UK and Ireland), Southeastern Europe (including Serbia, and Croatia), the Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), the Visegrad countries (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia), Western and Central Europe (Germany, Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Austria and Romania) and the Mediterranean (Italy and Malta). After 22/07/2011, there is a strong interest in the Civil Security system in Norway. A desk study of Norway will thus be carried out and integrated into the analysis.

Each study will provide data on similarity and variance amongst countries. This work package will ensure that such data is collected in a consistent way and in line with the commonly-agreed analytical dimension. As studies progress and information emerges, the project's main "mapping" process will take place in this WP, by which the WP will compile all the results and prepare those results for comparison.

The WP will ensure that analysis is done in a methodologically clear way, including intensive qualitative data gathering, drawing upon existing studies, interviewing practitioner participants, and conducting surveys. A practitioner "quality control" board will be consulted to provide ongoing assessment.

Task 2.1: Developing the mapping protocol for civil security systems in countries. This will consist in deciding on a common set of questions to ask, as well as qualitative and quantitative information to obtain in each case country. All partners will be involved in this process, and common guidelines will be distributed.

Task 2.2: Identification of key informants in each case country: key informants can be policy stakeholders, academics and/or practitioners both in the public and private sectors. Each partner will be responsible for identifying and establishing contact with key informants in their respective country case study regions, and for carrying out respective studies. Key informants can typically be identified through previous relevant contacts in a country, through literature and web searches, and through networking to establish new contacts. Furthermore, key informants can be involved in the project by taking direct contact as appropriate, and following up with key informants that are willing to contribute. Key informants will only be identified in ANVIL beneficiary countries in which the necessary ethics reviews have been conducted.

Task 2.3: First phase of data collection by partners. Collection and aggregation of preliminary data.

Task 2.4: Second phase of data collection. Collection and aggregation of final data; production of synthesis report in preparation for analysis in other work packages.

Roles of participants: Each partner will be asked to study one or several relevant country civil security systems considering the four dimensions outlined in the analytical framework (the cultural context, the legal context, its relations to citizens and stakeholders, and the role of the private sector). This study may involve surveys and selected interviews, but only in ANVIL beneficiary countries in which the necessary ethics reviews have been conducted.

The WP leader will compile and prepare these studies, to provide complementary and comparable analysis with respect to the WP3, in order to lay the ground for the comparison carried on in WP4.

Each case country (with interviews) will be allotted 6 PMs for contributing to task 2.1 and for completing tasks 2.2, 2.3, 2.4. Case country desk studies (without interviews) will be allotted 3 PMs. Additionally, UI will be allotted an extra 7 PMs for leading WP2 and SNDC will be allotted an extra 2 PMs for contributing to task 2.1

Resman's role: Assist in ensuring that the WP2 objectives are met and that the deliverables are of high quality and in accordance with the overall scope and required impact of the project.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	1.00
2	UTRECHT	6.00
3	UI	13.00
4	UEssex	12.00
5	IMO	6.00
6	HI	15.00
7	I.A.I.	6.00
8	IFSH	12.00
9	SNDC	8.00
10	FB	6.00
11	FRS	6.00
12	AMU	12.00
	Total	103.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D2.1	Compilation of country studies	3	103.00	R	PU	18
	Total		103.00			

Description of deliverables

D2.1) Compilation of country studies: Compilation of country studies: Each country study will result in a fairly brief case study (maximum 20 pages), detailing key features of the system. Together, these case studies will produce the first generalisable description of EU regional civil security architecture that is based on a systematic and meta-level analytical framework (which differs from traditional, simple institutional approaches at a purely descriptive level). A compilation of all studies will be assembled, allowing for clear and pragmatic comparison of the studies in WP4. (Interim (draft) Deliverable d2.1a at month 12; Final Deliverable 2.1 at month 18). [month 18]

	Schedule of relevant Milestones			
Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS7	Mapping protocol for countries developed	3	6	interim report 1
MS9	Key informants for country studies identified	3	7	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS14	First phase of data collection completed	3	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS19	Second phase of data collection completed	3	17	confirmed in interim report 2
MS21	Compilation of studies completed	3	18	confirmed in interim report 2

WT3:
Work package description

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Work package number [53]	WP3	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Mapping regional security associations		
Start month	6		
End month	18		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	7		

Objectives

- To map the existing regional security associations according to the analytical framework developed in WP1 and the methodology articulated by WP2.

Description of work and role of partners

In this WP we prepare and deliver a compilation of studies of relevant regional security organizations, completed and prepared for comparison. These associations include: the Southern European Cooperative Initiative (SECI); Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative – South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE); the Central European Initiative (CEI); the Visegrad group; the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS); Nordic, tri-Baltic and a five-plus-three cooperation framework; the Baltic Sea States Subregional Cooperation (BSSSC). Other bilateral and multilateral agreements on civil security cooperation may be also considered as case studies.

Task 3.1: Developing the mapping protocol for regional security associations. This will consist in deciding on a common set of questions to ask, as well as qualitative and quantitative information to obtain in each case region.
Task 3.2: Identification of key informants for each case regional association: key informants can be policy stakeholders, academics and/or practitioners. Each partner will be responsible for identifying and establishing contact with key informants in their respective regional association case study. Key informants can typically be identified through previous relevant contacts in a country, through literature and web searches, and through networking to establish new contacts. Furthermore, key informants can be involved in the project by taking direct contact as appropriate, and following up with key informants that are willing to contribute.
Task 3.3: First phase of data collection by partners. Collection and aggregation of preliminary data.
Task 3.4: Second phase of data collection. Collection and aggregation of final data; production of synthesis report in preparation for analysis in other work packages.

Role of participants:
Relevant partners will take responsibility for studying a one or several regional security associations considering the four dimensions outlined in the analytical framework (the cultural context, the legal context, its relations to citizens and stakeholders, and the role of the private sector) as far as it is possible taking into account the structural differences between a national security system and a regional security association. This study may involve selected interviews, but only in ANVIL beneficiary countries in which national ethics reviews have been conducted.
The WP leader will compile and prepare these studies, to provide complementary and comparable analysis with respect to the WP2, in order to lay the ground for the comparison carried on in WP4.

All partners except Resman allotted 1 PM for participating in Task 3.1.

For Tasks 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4:
I.A.I (2 PM), IMO (7 PM) and FB (7 PM) will work together in studying the Southern European Cooperative Initiative (SECI); Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Initiative – South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE); the Central European Initiative (CEI), with IMO and FB taking a proportionally larger responsibility (based on their PM allotment) for the work;
SNDC (4 PM) and HI (4 PM) will work together in studying Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS); Nordic, tri-Baltic and Baltic Sea States Subregional Cooperation (BSSSC) as appropriate, again with SNDC and HI assuming a proportional role based on the PM allotment for the work

AMU (4 PM) will take primary responsibility for Visegrad.

Additionally, UI (3 PM), UEssex (3 PM), IFSH (2 PM) will consider other relevant bilateral and multilateral agreements, and assist with the above regional associations as necessary.

Finally I.A.I. is allotted an extra 8 PM for leading WP3

Resman's role: Assist in ensuring that the WP3 objectives are met and that the deliverables are of high quality and in accordance with the overall scope and required impact of the project.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	1.00
2	UTRECHT	1.00
3	UI	4.00
4	UEssex	4.00
5	IMO	8.00
6	HI	4.00
7	I.A.I.	11.00
8	IFSH	2.00
9	SNDC	4.00
10	FB	8.00
11	FRS	1.00
12	AMU	5.00
	Total	53.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D3.1	Mapping regional associations	7	53.00	R	PU	18
	Total		53.00			

Description of deliverables

D3.1) Mapping regional associations: Deliverable D3.1: Report: Compilation of case studies providing a first comprehensive description of regional security associations in Europe, based on a sound analytical framework and prepared for effective comparisons. Each case study provided by partner should be fairly brief, explaining the main characteristics of the association in relation to the four dimensions. (Interim (draft) Deliverable d3.1a at month 12; Final Deliverable 3.1 at month 18). [month 18]

	Schedule of relevant Milestones			
Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS10	Mapping protocol for regional associations developed	7	8	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS11	Key informants for regional association studies identified	7	9	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS17	First phase of data collection completed	7	13	confirmed in interim report 2
MS20	Second phase of data collection completed	7	17	confirmed in interim report 2
MS22	Compilation of studies completed	7	18	confirmed in interim report 2

WT3:
Work package description

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Work package number [53]	WP4	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Comparing and assessing civil security systems		
Start month	10		
End month	24		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	8		

Objectives

-To compare and assess civil security systems in countries and regions in Europe
- To provide advice, based on consensually agreed upon objective indicators, about what changes or modifications that might result in improvements to the security situation in certain regions or countries where this might be desired by EU policymakers.

Description of work and role of partners

This work package will include making cross-national and cross-regional comparisons to identify and understand key differences between systems.
Task 4.1: Based on the quality and quantity of data coming out of the case studies in WP2 and WP3, as well as the robustness of the framework in WP1, develop a protocol on how the assessment will be carried out.
Task 4.2: Carry out assessment. Key differences identified in WPs 1-3 will be assessed using the indicators of effectiveness and efficiency. More specifically, this will mean (a) comparing descriptive variables across cases, including cultural and legal context, operation, role of citizens, and role of private sector, (b) applying normative criteria, including effectiveness and efficiency, to the findings, and (c) compatibility in a European context. (d) providing advice about what changes or modifications that might result in improvements to the security situation in certain regions or countries where this might be desired by EU policymakers.
All partners except Resman allotted 4 PMs for participating in Task 4.1 and 4.2; IFSH allotted an extra 5 PMs for leading WP4.

Resman's role: Assist in ensuring that the WP4 objectives are met and that the deliverables are of high quality and in accordance with the overall scope and required impact of the project.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	1.00
2	UTRECHT	4.00
3	UI	4.00
4	UEssex	4.00
5	IMO	4.00
6	HI	4.00
7	I.A.I.	4.00
8	IFSH	9.00
9	SNDC	4.00
10	FB	4.00

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
11	FRS	4.00
12	AMU	4.00
	Total	50.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D4.1	Synthesis report on comparison of civil security systems	8	25.00	R	PU	20
D4.2	Final analytical report on comparison of civil security systems	8	25.00	R	PU	24
		Total	50.00			

Description of deliverables

D4.1) Synthesis report on comparison of civil security systems: Deliverable D4.1: Report to serve as an "chapeau" document to map the empirical range and synthesise the findings of the case studies above. Deliverable d4.1a (interim report) at month 15; Deliverable d4.1b (final report) at month 20 [month 20]

D4.2) Final analytical report on comparison of civil security systems: Deliverable 4.2: Report at month 24 that presents critical findings and future outlook from a research perspective, in coordination with practitioner's feedback and policy recommendations developed in WP5. [month 24]

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS15	Assessment protocol completed and agreed upon	8	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS24	First phase of WP4 assessment completed	8	19	confirmed in interim report 1
MS26	Second phase of WP4 assessment completed	8	23	confirmed in final report

<div align="right">

WT3:
Work package description

</div>

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Work package number [53]	WP5	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Ensuring EU added-value for policy stakeholders		
Start month	2		
End month	24		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	4		

Objectives

-To ensure the project yields EU added value for policy stakeholders
-To engage and disseminate to policy stakeholders during the project

Description of work and role of partners

This WP will be dedicated to ensuring that the project outputs enable maximum EU-added value for policy stakeholders. It will also act as a channel to engage and disseminate to policy stakeholders during the project. This will be accomplished with the following tasks:

Task 5.1 Identifying key informants for ensuring EU-added value for policy stakeholders. (All partners except Resman: 1 PM) Each partner will be responsible for recruiting and maintaining contact with key informants from their country and region and other countries and regions where they may have appropriate contacts.

Task 5.1: Organising the input of policy stakeholders to ensure that WPs 1-4 are maximally relevant for contributing to the debate concerning 'not one security fits all'. (All partners except Resman: 1 PM). Each partner will be responsible for facilitating the acquisition of the input from key informants that they have identified and recruited to the project.

Task 5.3: Final evaluation (or 'validation') of the outputs of WPs1-4 to determine whether the project's civil security systems assessment methodology is valid and appropriate for policy stakeholders. (UEssex 8 PM; UTRECHT 2 PM; UI 2 PM). This will include a workshop bringing policy stakeholders and project participants together to effectuate the evaluation and to encourage dissemination among as wide an audience as possible.

Resman's role: Assist in ensuring that the WP5 objectives are met and that the deliverables are of high quality and in accordance with the overall scope and required impact of the project.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	1.00
2	UTRECHT	4.00
3	UI	4.00
4	UEssex	10.00
5	IMO	2.00
6	HI	2.00
7	I.A.I.	2.00
8	IFSH	2.00
9	SNDC	2.00
10	FB	2.00

WT3:
Work package description

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
11	FRS	2.00
12	AMU	2.00
	Total	35.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D5.1	Report on EU-added value for policy stakeholders	4	35.00	R	PU	24
			Total	35.00		

Description of deliverables

D5.1) Report on EU-added value for policy stakeholders: 1 Report on added value for policy stakeholders (Interim (draft) Deliverable d5.1a at month 12; Interim (draft) Deliverable d5.1b at month 18; Final Deliverable 5.1 at month 24). [month 24]

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS4	Key informants identified for WP5	4	3	confirmed in interim report 1
MS5	WP5 input given to WP1	4	5	confirmed in interim report 1
MS12	WP5 input given to WP2	4	11	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS13	WP5 input given to WP3	4	11	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS18	WP5 input given to WP4	4	14	confirmed in interim report 2
MS25	WP5 evaluation workshop completed	4	21	confirmed in final report

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

One form per Work Package			

Work package number [53]	WP6	Type of activity [54]	SUPP
Work package title	Dissemination and exploitation		
Start month	1		
End month	24		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	1		

Objectives

-To disseminate information about the project, its objectives, the approaches and results using a web site, reports, publications and presentations.
-To facilitate collaboration and information exchange between relevant communities working in security systems.
-To promote, where applicable, the use of the outputs from the project amongst the target groups.
-To engage in two-way communication channels with users and academic communities for disseminating the project deliverables and conclusions within the wider civil security systems context.
-To set up an effective dissemination and exploitation plan.
-To publish results in academic and professional journals.

Description of work and role of partners

The project's dissemination strategy will be focused on ensuring the project results are fed into policymaking processes at both national and European levels. At the national level, project partners will outline a local dissemination strategy including direct mailing of research results, face-to-face meetings with practitioners, op-ed pieces in magazines that are read by policy makers, and seminars targeted at, and including policy makers. At the EU level, similar strategies will be carried out in cooperation with two Brussels-based policy platforms. The first is the European Policy Centre (EPC), an independent think-tank well-known by most EU practitioners. Through Mark Rhinard of SIIA, who is also a Senior Advisor at the EPC, the project will publish its key findings in one of EPC's publication outlets (e.g. an issue paper or policy brief). The EPC's mailing lists reach more than 6000 EU practitioners. In addition, we will present our results in Brussels (in cooperation with the EPC). The second Brussels platform is the Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA), a network of 30 international affairs think-tanks of which several consortium partners are members. TEPSA's networks, email groups, and Brussels office will provide a further platform to ensure the project's findings are publicized in the EU practitioner community. The project's findings will be disseminated through the CIVPRO Civil Protection Network which is a pan European network of research institutes and corporations dealing with studies on civil protection and emergency management. Additionally, the policy stakeholder group in WP5 will serve as a supplementary avenue for disseminating ANVIL results during the project and achieving the expected impact.

-Task 6.1: Project dissemination activities during the project (Resman 4 PM, other partners 2 PM each)
This includes the proejct website, user database, glossary, reports, publications and presentations.
-The central website of the project will be designed and developed for supporting the needs of the consortium management and internal synergy. In parallel it should provide for the widest possible visibility of the project objectives and its results. A database of end-users identified in the projectwill be maintained by the coordinator. At the outset, the consortium will use existing contacts. The database will be continually updated throughout the project. An on-line Glossary of project-related terms will be developed for facilitating the communication with Users.
-Reports, publications and presentations (Resman 2 PM; Other partners 2 PM each) Documents created within the project will be made available through the project website, distributed to the wider community using mailing and e-mail lists and they will be promoted using RSS and blogging as appropriate. Furthermore, printed dissemination material of the project such as brochures, publications and leaflets will be produced and distributed in relevant events. The consortium will prepare a brief project Fact Sheet suitable for web publishing, within one month from the start of the project, and to maintain and update it until the contract expiry date. The Fact Sheet will outline the project rationale and objectives; specify the project's technical baseline and intended

target groups and application domains; and detail intermediate and final outputs. Partners have experience and interest in publishing in academic journals and at academic conferences, and also creating web publications. A major commitment in the project is guaranteeing URL persistence for the documents and publications that will be produced by the project consortium for at least two years after the official end of the project.

We will capture our ANVIL findings in a 5-minute video that all partners can use to share with policymakers and respondents. The video will be uploaded on the project website.

Additionally, the consortium will deliver regularly to the EC upon request, preparation of high quality power point presentations, videos, brochures, factsheets, posters and illustrative graphic materials (pie charts, tables, flow charts), photos of the A2 poster quality (300 dpi resolution, min 40 cm x 20 cm), on the concept, intermediate results and final results of the project.

-Task 6.2: Dissemination and Exploitation Plan (Resman 2 PM) The Dissemination and Awareness Plan is a report that will describe the plans of the consortium for disseminating the knowledge gained during the work, and for exploiting the results of the project among the different target groups.

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	6.00
2	UTRECHT	2.00
3	UI	2.00
4	UEssex	2.00
5	IMO	2.00
6	HI	2.00
7	I.A.I.	2.00
8	IFSH	2.00
9	SNDC	2.00
10	FB	2.00
11	FRS	2.00
12	AMU	2.00
	Total	28.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D6.1	Project dissemination report	1	26.00	R	PU	20
D6.2	Dissemination and exploitation plan	1	2.00	R	PU	24
		Total	28.00			

Description of deliverables

D6.1) Project dissemination report: D6.1) This will be a report of the project's dissemination activities and tools: web-site and glossary, Standard Fact Sheet, brochures, presentation and publications, video, etc. The first

interim version of the report at month 6 (Interim Deliverable 6.1a) as well as updated versions in month 12 (Interim Deliverable 6.1b), with the final deliverable at [month 20]. The final deliverable will include a summary of all significant publications anticipated from the project, including in academic journals. [month 20]

D6.2) Dissemination and exploitation plan: D6.3) Dissemination and exploitation plan: This is the culmination of Task 6.3. Interim (draft) Deliverable 6.3a at month 12; Interim (draft) Deliverable 6.3b at month 18. Final Deliverable at [month 24]. [month 24]

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Work package number [53]	WP7	Type of activity [54]	MGT
Work package title	Management		
Start month	1		
End month	24		
Lead beneficiary number [55]	1		

Objectives

-To ensure that the project progresses according to the time plan and within the budgetary constraints set out in the proposal.
-To ensure that all deliverables are finished on time and of high quality
-To ensure that the project's scientific and technical objectives are achieved
-To ensure that cost statements and other necessary documents from all partners are delivered to the Commission in a timely manner.
-To ensure that project meetings are well organized and adequately reported.
-To ensure that project communication channels are effective, efficient and transparent for all concerned.

Description of work and role of partners

-Task 7.1 Project management and reporting (Resman 10 PM)
The coordinator, Resman, has overall responsibility for consortium management and reporting. This will include:
• Communications with the Commission for all administrative and financial project issues.
• Participation and consultation in on-going communication between partners and with the Advisory Board
• Cost statement reports from all partners and efficient distribution of project funds
• Handling of legal issues, IPR issues and maintenance of the consortium agreement.
• Handling of the project correspondence and the day-to-day requests from partners and external bodies
• Implementing and maintaining the project infrastructure, e.g., the internal platform for information exchange and email lists.
• Compilation and distribution of all reports to be delivered by the project
• Coordination and communication with other relevant SEC projects
• Providing guidance, support and oversight of all partners during the project implementation, especially to work package leaders, and with specific reference to ensuring that partners complete their project work in accordance with the scientific and technical objectives set out in the proposal, and that this is done on time and within budget.
• Ensuring that milestones are reached and deliverables finished on time and of high quality.

• There will be a periodic report at month 12 and a final report at month 24. There will be two interim reports at months 6 and 18.

-Task 7. 2 Project meetings (Resman 7 PM)
There will be five meetings of the full consortium during the project. The first full consortium meeting is the kick-off meeting. This will be organized by the coordinator. The purpose of the kick-off meeting is to discuss and raise issues of the project implementation, including finances and reporting. This includes a review in detail of project aims, objectives, timescales, tasks and responsibilities in each work package, and any changes to the work program approved by the Commission. Work package presentations and discussions on the role of each partner will be lead by the work package leaders, ensuring that roles are understood by all. Introductions from all partners, their organizations and their main activities will be included so that the full picture can be seen and understood by all present, and so that familiarity can be established among the partners. Subsequent full consortium meetings will be important for discussing the progress in relation to the work program and to seek input and feedback on the deliverables that are imminent or have been received since the previous meeting, including possible issues of concern of the Commission, of the core partner management group or of any of the

other partners. Reports from these meetings will be included in the the interim reports at month 7 & 19, and as separate deliverables for the Kick-off meeting, the third consortium meeting and the final consortium meeting. The location of each meeting will rotate so that awareness of the project can be increased in the host countries. The host partner will help the coordinator with organization, accommodation and provide details about travel at least one month in advance of the meeting, and in consultation with the coordinator. The coordinator will develop the agenda and chair the meetings and ensure that minutes are adequately recorded, circulated for comments, and then finally distributed. Included with these will be a list of priority actions, who is responsible for completing them and proposed deadlines for completion before the next full consortium meeting. The tentative schedule is as follows:

• MS23: Kick-off meeting (month 1), tentative location Brussels
• MS24: 2nd consortium meeting (month 6), tentative location Utrecht
• MS25: 3rd consortium meeting (month 12), tentative location Hamburg
• MS26: 4th consortium meeting (month 18), tentative location Rome
• MS27: Final consortium meeting (month 24), tentative location Stockholm

Person-Months per Participant

Participant number [10]	Participant short name [11]	Person-months per participant
1	Resman	17.00
	Total	17.00

List of deliverables

Delive-rable Number [61]	Deliverable Title	Lead benefi-ciary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature [62]	Dissemi-nation level [63]	Delivery date [64]
D7.1	Kick-off meeting report	1	1.00	R	RE	2
D7.2	Interim report 1	1	2.00	R	RE	7
D7.3	Interim report 2	1	3.00	R	RE	19
D7.4	Personal data use authorizations	1	1.00	R	RE	4
D7.5	Report on ethical issues	1	2.00	R	RE	21
		Total	9.00			

Description of deliverables

D7.1) Kick-off meeting report: Kick-off meeting report: This will be a report of the progress made during the kick-off meeting. [month 2] [month 2]

D7.2) Interim report 1: Interim report 1: This will be a progress report covering the work finished in months 1-6. [month 6] [month 7]

D7.3) Interim report 2: Interim report 2: This will be an interim report covering the progress in months 12-18. [month 18] [month 19]

D7.4) Personal data use authorizations: Personal data use authorizations: This will be a compilation of the appropriate authorizations obtained from data protection authorities in each of the project countries where personal data will be obtained. [month 4] [month 4]

D7.5) Report on ethical issues: Report on ethical issues: This will be a report identifying ethical issues and how they were handled in the project. [month 21] [month 21]

Schedule of relevant Milestones

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS1	Kickoff meeting held	1	1	confirmed in interim report 1
MS8	2nd consortium meeting held	1	6	confirmed in interim report 1
MS16	3rd consortium meeting held	1	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS23	4th consortium meeting held	1	18	confirmed in interim report 2
MS27	Final consortium meeting held	1	24	confirmed in final report

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

List and Schedule of Milestones					
Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	WP number [53]	Lead benefi-ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS1	Kickoff meeting held	WP7	1	1	confirmed in interim report 1
MS2	Key WP1 study features identified	WP1	2	2	confirmed in interim report 1
MS3	Key WP1 informants identified	WP1	2	3	confirmed in interim report 1
MS4	Key informants identified for WP5	WP5	4	3	confirmed in interim report 1
MS5	WP5 input given to WP1	WP5	4	5	confirmed in interim report 1
MS6	WP1.3 workshop held	WP1	1	6	confirmed in interim report 1
MS7	Mapping protocol for countries developed	WP2	3	6	interim report 1
MS8	2nd consortium meeting held	WP7	1	6	confirmed in interim report 1
MS9	Key informants for country studies identified	WP2	3	7	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS10	Mapping protocol for regional associations developed	WP3	7	8	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS11	Key informants for regional association studies identified	WP3	7	9	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS12	WP5 input given to WP2	WP5	4	11	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS13	WP5 input given to WP3	WP5	4	11	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS14	First phase of data collection completed	WP2	3	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS15	Assessment protocol completed and agreed upon	WP4	8	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS16	3rd consortium meeting held	WP7	1	12	confirmed in periodic report 1
MS17	First phase of data collection completed	WP3	7	13	confirmed in interim report 2
MS18	WP5 input given to WP4	WP5	4	14	confirmed in interim report 2

Milestone number [59]	Milestone name	WP number [53]	Lead benefi- ciary number	Delivery date from Annex I [60]	Comments
MS19	Second phase of data collection completed	WP2	3	17	confirmed in interim report 2
MS20	Second phase of data collection completed	WP3	7	17	confirmed in interim report 2
MS21	Compilation of studies completed	WP2	3	18	confirmed in interim report 2
MS22	Compilation of studies completed	WP3	7	18	confirmed in interim report 2
MS23	4th consortium meeting held	WP7	1	18	confirmed in interim report 2
MS24	First phase of WP4 assessment completed	WP4	8	19	confirmed in interim report 1
MS25	WP5 evaluation workshop completed	WP5	4	21	confirmed in final report
MS26	Second phase of WP4 assessment completed	WP4	8	23	confirmed in final report
MS27	Final consortium meeting held	WP7	1	24	confirmed in final report

WT5:
Tentative schedule of Project Reviews

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

Tentative schedule of Project Reviews			
Review number [65]	Tentative timing	Planned venue of review	Comments, if any
RV 1	12	Brussels	This will be a mid-term review after M12
RV 2	24	Brussels	This will be a final review after M24

WT6:
Project Effort by Beneficiary and Work Package

Project Number [1]		284678		Project Acronym [2]		ANVIL		

Indicative efforts (man-months) per Beneficiary per Work Package

Beneficiary number and short-name	WP 1	WP 2	WP 3	WP 4	WP 5	WP 6	WP 7	Total per Beneficiary
1 - Resman	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	6.00	17.00	29.00
2 - UTRECHT	9.00	6.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	26.00
3 - UI	4.00	13.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0.00	31.00
4 - UEssex	4.00	12.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	0.00	36.00
5 - IMO	1.00	6.00	8.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	23.00
6 - HI	1.00	15.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	28.00
7 - I.A.I.	1.00	6.00	11.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	26.00
8 - IFSH	1.00	12.00	2.00	9.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	28.00
9 - SNDC	1.00	8.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	21.00
10 - FB	1.00	6.00	8.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	23.00
11 - FRS	1.00	6.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	16.00
12 - AMU	1.00	12.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	26.00
Total	27.00	103.00	53.00	50.00	35.00	28.00	17.00	313.00

Project Number [1]		284678	Project Acronym [2]		ANVIL

Indicative efforts per Activity Type per Beneficiary

Activity type	Part. 1 Resman	Part. 2 UTRECHT	Part. 3 UI	Part. 4 UEssex	Part. 5 IMO	Part. 6 HI	Part. 7 I.A.I.	Part. 8 IFSH	Part. 9 SNDC	Part. 10 FB	Part. 11 FRS	Part. 12 AMU	Total
3. Consortium Management activities													
WP 7	17.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.00
Total Management	17.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.00
4. Other activities													
Total other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Work Packages for Support activities													
WP 1	2.00	9.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	27.00
WP 2	1.00	6.00	13.00	12.00	6.00	15.00	6.00	12.00	8.00	6.00	6.00	12.00	103.00
WP 3	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	8.00	4.00	11.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	1.00	5.00	53.00
WP 4	1.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	9.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	50.00
WP 5	1.00	4.00	4.00	10.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	35.00
WP 6	6.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	28.00
Total Support	12.00	26.00	31.00	36.00	23.00	28.00	26.00	28.00	21.00	23.00	16.00	26.00	296.00
Total	29.00	26.00	31.00	36.00	23.00	28.00	26.00	28.00	21.00	23.00	16.00	26.00	313.00

WT8:
Project Effort and costs

Project Number [1]	284678	Project Acronym [2]	ANVIL

| | | Project efforts and costs | | | | | | |

Benefi-ciary number	Beneficiary short name	Estimated eligible costs (whole duration of the project)					Total receipts (€)	Requested EU contribution (€)
		Effort (PM)	Personnel costs (€)	Subcontracting (€)	Other Direct costs (€)	Indirect costs OR lump sum, flat-rate or scale-of-unit (€)	Total costs	
1	Resman	29.00	328,599.00	4,000.00	45,975.00	37,458.00	416,032.00	0.00	404,793.00
2	UTRECHT	26.00	187,356.00	6,500.00	8,810.00	39,233.00	241,899.00	0.00	216,397.00
3	UI	31.00	143,313.00	1,875.00	8,814.00	30,425.40	184,427.40	0.00	164,650.00
4	UEssex	36.00	186,012.00	875.00	9,714.00	39,145.20	235,746.20	0.00	210,301.00
5	IMO	23.00	57,753.00	0.00	6,518.00	12,854.20	77,125.20	0.00	68,769.00
6	HI	28.00	173,628.00	0.00	6,863.00	36,098.20	216,589.20	0.00	193,125.00
7	I.A.I.	26.00	175,890.00	1,400.00	7,965.00	36,771.00	222,026.00	0.00	198,124.00
8	IFSH	28.00	127,560.00	1,400.00	5,314.00	26,574.80	160,848.80	0.00	143,575.00
9	SNDC	21.00	117,138.00	0.00	4,939.00	24,415.00	146,492.00	0.00	130,622.00
10	FB	23.00	52,785.00	0.00	4,489.00	11,454.80	68,728.80	0.00	61,283.00
11	FRS	16.00	110,992.00	0.00	8,165.00	23,831.40	142,988.40	0.00	127,497.00
12	AMU	26.00	77,558.00	0.00	6,640.00	16,839.60	101,037.60	0.00	90,091.00
	Total	313.00	1,738,584.00	16,050.00	124,206.00	335,100.60	2,213,940.60	0.00	2,009,227.00

1. Project number

The project number has been assigned by the Commission as the unique identifier for your project. It cannot be changed. The project number **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B)** to prevent errors during its handling.

2. Project acronym

Use the project acronym as given in the submitted proposal. It cannot be changed unless agreed so during the negotiations. The same acronym **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B)** to prevent errors during its handling.

53. Work Package number

Work package number: WP1, WP2, WP3, ..., WPn

54. Type of activity

For all FP7 projects each work package must relate to one (and only one) of the following possible types of activity (only if applicable for the chosen funding scheme – must correspond to the GPF Form Ax.v):

• **RTD/INNO =** Research and technological development including scientific coordination - applicable for Collaborative Projects and Networks of Excellence

• **DEM =** Demonstration - applicable for collaborative projects and Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups

• **MGT =** Management of the consortium - applicable for all funding schemes

• **OTHER =** Other specific activities, applicable for all funding schemes

• **COORD =** Coordination activities – applicable only for CAs

• **SUPP =** Support activities – applicable only for SAs

55. Lead beneficiary number

Number of the beneficiary leading the work in this work package.

56. Person-months per work package

The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

57. Start month

Relative start date for the work in the specific work packages, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

58. End month

Relative end date, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

59. Milestone number

Milestone number:MS1, MS2, …, MSn

60. Delivery date for Milestone

Month in which the milestone will be achieved. Month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

61. Deliverable number

Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

62. Nature

Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes

R = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

63. Dissemination level

Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

• **PU =** Public

• **PP =** Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)

• **RE =** Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)

• **CO =** Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)

• **Restreint UE =** Classified with the classification level "Restreint UE" according to Commission Decision 2001/844 and amendments

• **Confidentiel UE =** Classified with the mention of the classification level "Confidentiel UE" according to Commission Decision 2001/844 and amendments

• **Secret UE =** Classified with the mention of the classification level "Secret UE" according to Commission Decision 2001/844 and amendments

64. Delivery date for Deliverable

Month in which the deliverables will be available. Month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date

65. Review number

Review number: RV1, RV2, ..., RVn

66. Tentative timing of reviews

Month after which the review will take place. Month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

67. Person-months per Deliverable

The total number of person-month allocated to each deliverable.

Part B

Part B

Table of Contents

B1 Concept and objectives, progress beyond the state-of-the-art, S/T methodology and work plan

B1.1 Concept and project objective(s)

Background

Civil security systems in Europe display a wide variation in structures, policies, rules and practices: countries have organized differently in their efforts to protect citizens from a variety of threats to their security and safety. Each system evolved in a unique historical and cultural context. Each is bound by different legal/constitutional frameworks. Each system consists of different actors and is governed differently. Each system has different relations with private sector parties. And each system relates to its citizens in unique ways.

Deep divergences and wide variety in thinking and practice may not be conducive to the development of shared civil security capacities. The ESRIF, for instance, concludes that "EU Member States' governments do not have a comparable set of security strategies or priorities to address adequately the current security challenges Europe faces" (ESRIF Final Report, 2009:213). The EU has begun to address these differences with an eye towards providing value-added assistance to overcome both strategic and operational challenges (Commission, 2008; Boin and Rhinard, 2008; European Policy Centre, 2006).

The security challenges that European states face – now and in the future – are daunting indeed. The challenges are also broadening and deepening. Increased complexity of critical infrastructures, new forms of terrorism, climate change, extraordinary technological innovation, international power shifts, cyber attacks, energy shortages and environmental degradation create new and unforeseen challenges that national governments are not well equipped to handle (Rosenthal, et al 2001; Lagadec, 2009). The traditional nation state that saw crisis management as a core function of government must today cooperate with neighbours, regional organisations, and the international community and private sector to protect its citizens. Such cross-border cooperation requires, among other capacities, shared threat conceptions, joint approaches to crises and disasters, complementary capacities, interoperable command structures, shared training and joint exercises.

Experience and research shows that the great variety amongst crisis management structures in national systems, processes and practices is not necessarily a bad thing. Analysts agree that there is not "one best way" to approach crisis and disaster management for all types of contingencies. Given the variety of major threats faced by countries, some variety in practice and process is to be expected and respected. Attempts to further cooperate across borders must take into account diversity amongst national and regional civil security architectures. This includes building on existing strengths and learning lessons based on past experience.

Concept

This project draws together existing data and collects additional information where necessary to map the variety and similarities in Europe's regional civil security structures, practices and cultures. It investigates if, and to what extent, variety affects the safety of Europe's citizens (for better or worse). In doing so, our results give policy stakeholders a clear view of which kind of systems that could successfully enhance the security in certain regions. Finally, by including policy stakeholders in all phases of the analysis process, we ensure that the project contributes to and gives EU-added value to the debate concerning "not one security fits all".

We define "civil security systems" as the policies, bodies and mechanisms that a country or region has in place to protect it against new and urgent threats to the security of people and/or the functioning critical infrastructures. Each government in Europe has such a system in place to provide "societal security" (Sundelius 2005) – we may say that this is a core task of the sovereign state (Rosenthal 1990). Citizens expect their governments to design and operate capabilities to prevent risks from emerging, to prepare for crises and disasters, to protect values and infrastructures from harm, to respond effectively with sufficient capacity and effective decision-making when a crisis does occur, and to recover swiftly after a crisis strikes.

A crucial question is how we can measure the quality – defined in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy – of these civil security systems. In defining quality, we should keep in mind that different systems can be equally effective. What risks a nation should prepare for differ per country or region. In recent years, we have seen forest fires in Southern Europe, a massive earthquake in Italy, flooding in Eastern Europe, terrorist attacks in the UK and Spain, and infrastructure failures in Scandinavia (to name but a few recent events). In response to different crises, and shaped by different administrative traditions, risk cultures and legal constraints, different systems have evolved. We want to know how we can assess these systems in an impartial, feasible and acceptable manner.

The question of quality has not been comprehensively addressed by researchers. There are studies on the quality of police forces, fire and rescue services, or military units. But what is absent is a comprehensive way to assess the quality of an entire civil security system. We simply do not know how to measure the quality (in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy) of crisis and disaster management; it is even harder to measure the quality of the systems in which these activities are embedded. In this project, we develop indicators of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy which will allow us to assess and compare regional architectures. This will be a major breakthrough in our thinking about security systems.

In developing these indicators, we will draw on work done in the field of crisis management (effectiveness), public administration (efficiency) and political science (legitimacy). We will use existing crisis management research to establish how exactly the efforts of a civil security system relate to the (perceived) safety and security of citizens. We will identify and use established ways in public administration research to assess if these systems produce value for money. We will access the extensive research body on citizen trust (Fukuyama, 1995; Gambetta, 1988; Hardin, 2002, 2006; Hoffman, 2006; Putnam, 1993) to identify a feasible way to measure the legitimacy of civil security systems.

Objectives

This project has six main objectives:

- To pinpoint essential similarities and differences between civil security systems across Europe, through mapping and comparing, especially with regard to relevant cultural phenomena and legal determinations.
- To study a representative number of security regional architectures in a comparative analysis regarding the sharing of responsibilities between public and private bodies and the role that citizens play in regional security architectures.
- To determine whether these systems are efficient and effective in protecting their citizens (i.e. to determine what works and what doesn't work in existing civil security systems).
- To provide advice about what changes or modifications could result in improvements to the security situation in regions or countries where this is desired by EU policymakers
- To ensure that the project gives EU-added value to policy stakeholders
- To link to future research needs where possible

Elaborating on these objectives in turn: For the first two, our project seeks to pinpoint essential similarities and differences between civil security systems across Europe, through mapping and then comparing. While quite a bit of empirical analysis has resulted in a variety of case descriptions (see *inter alia* MSB 2009; Kuipers and Matzen 2008; UN-ISDR 2006), our overall knowledge about these systems is far from complete. Moreover, existing studies do not allow for easy comparisons. Many studies, conducted by the analytical community and official sources, exist, but they use different dimensions and variables in their descriptions. Several comparative studies exist – one of the most recent ones is found in the ESRIF Final Report – but these studies typically choose countries seemingly at random and assess them on a narrow set of dimensions. Since analysts and researchers select different variables and dimensions with each mapping exercise, and since systems constantly evolve to address new threats, it is impossible to generalise the conclusions of existing studies. We will map European civil security systems on comprehensive and consistent set of dimensions. This will allow us to both describe national systems in a holistic way and to compare countries along similar dimensions at a meta-level. This will provide one of the most detailed, accurate, and comprehensive pictures of different European civil security architectures thus assembled.

For the third objective, we want to know whether the studied systems (or regional architecture, see below) are efficient and effective in protecting its citizens. Does one system in one country appear to deliver security in a more efficient fashion than another? Are citizens "safer" in some systems rather than others? Does it matter how a civil security system is organized? What is the effect of different stakeholders taking part in security, whether these be political actors or private industry partners? What exactly can citizen participation bring to a civil security system? Do some systems appear to be better equipped for seamlessly cooperating across borders? Do certain systems work better in a particular threat environment (e.g. earthquakes) yet also in the face of other threats (e.g. flooding, pandemics or terrorism) or emerging threats (e.g. ash clouds or cyber attacks)? Such questions are daunting, but can be addressed through systematic comparison and by drawing upon existing research and official documents. We will develop criteria for evaluating the quality of civil security systems, and operationalise those criteria so they can be studied across Europe. This exercise is rarely explicitly done in existing studies and crisis management literature, but is critical to our goals of enhancing national and regional systems, improving the interoperability between systems, and exploring the effectiveness and efficiency of security systems. This task is long overdue.

Finally, the last three objectives are for achieving the desired call text impact of providing a clear view of which kind of systems that could successfully enhance the security in certain regions, and contribute and give EU-added value to the debate concerning 'not one security fits all'. This includes linking to future research needs where possible. To accomplish this, (as is discussed more fully in Section 3.1 below) we must give specific advice about possible improvements and include policy stakeholders in the process. We need to analyze the data produced in the national and European regional settings with a view towards identifying patterns of interest to these policy stakeholders. Such patterns might be successful interoperability at the regional level, successful threat-specific responses, and successful generic capacities that the supranational level should know about and learn from. European-wide civil security cooperation is one area of special current interest. In an era of increasing transnational risks, cooperation across borders is a necessity for improving safety and security (Ansell, Boin and Keller, 2010). Successful civil security cooperation depends on a thorough understanding of key differences between systems, finding areas of common ground, and ensuring ways to enhance security when different views of providing security exist. At the sub-European level, regional organisations are increasingly adding a "civil protection" dimension to their cooperation, complementing regional security architectures. The Mediterranean Southern European Cooperative Initiative (SECI), which includes the Balkans, Danube countries and Turkey, is just one example. Moreover, ad-hoc and bilateral cooperation arrangements are also in place between EU countries. A clear understanding of the contours and extent of these initiatives, and how they relate to one another, has yet to be achieved in existing studies. At the EU level, cooperation on civil

security issues is progressing rapidly. Recent analysis, much of it from members of the proposed consortium, shows that European cooperation on "societal security" is one of the fastest areas of EU integration (see Boin, Ekengren and Rhinard 2009; Kirchner and Sperling 2008; ESRIF Final Report 2008; European Policy Centre 2006). The EU has implemented a variety of new strategies (e.g. on internal security, civil protection, critical infrastructure protection, and Baltic/Danube regional cooperation), capacities (e.g. European situational awareness, threat assessment, and decision protocols), and tools (e.g. the civil protection mechanisms, early warning systems, Solidarity Fund, and a permanent crisis mechanism) to further this cooperation in the face of new threats. But these developments have not emerged without challenge from national governments. A stronger knowledge foundation of national and regional differences in Europe will help to define where EU cooperation and the new EU mechanisms such as CCA, MIC and SitCen, to name a few, can add the most value, and to shed light on future research needs in this area.

Four analytical dimensions

To accomplish the above objectives, this project provides a comparative analysis of diverse security systems in Europe, highlighting patterns of similarity and contrast with a view to explaining different levels of effectiveness and efficiency in different regions.

We will map the various systems along four essential analytical dimensions, which we lay out below:

1. *Cultural and historical aspects of a security system.* Administrative traditions, earlier experiences with critical crises and disasters, dominant threat perceptions, conceptions of the proper role of government in times of crisis – these are but a few factors that shape how a security system is structured and how it functions. It is notoriously difficult to measure cultural characteristics of a regional system or country (without falling into the trap of stereotyping). We will build on the approach described in the ESRIF Final Report, which is based on the influential cultural theory laid out by Mary Douglas and Aaron Wildavsky. We will improve on this approach by simplifying it and making it easier to quantify (which will allow for informed comparisons). In addition, we will look for indicators of dominant crisis and disaster management approaches: some systems may be more focused on prevention, whereas other systems may rather invest in response capacities and societal resilience (Wildavsky, 1988). We will use "signature crises" to compare how different systems function under sudden stress. The way in which the various systems approached the Millennium IT problem (a test of preparation and stakeholder interaction; late 1990s), the increasing intensity of natural disasters (a test of system resilience and societal expectations; early to mid 2000s) and the rise of new forms of terrorism (a test of legal constraints and risk tolerance; early to mid 2000s) each will offer a spotlight on differences in national risk cultures.

2. *Legal/constitutional aspects of a security system.* Civil security systems differ in terms of the legal and constitutional contexts in which they operate. This context shapes the general contours of a civil security system. It determines the lines of authority connecting a civil security system to its broader political context, influences the role played by lead authorities (e.g. justice ministries, interior ministries, or defence ministries), affects the extent to which authority is delegated from the political to administrative level, and shapes the relationship between civil security systems and other key actors (e.g. the military, industry, and international organisations). The legal/constitutional context also has an operational effect on a civil security system, including what kinds of threats can be pursued, the definition of relevant threats, how a system "scales up" in level of response required, and how that system interacts with international organisations (see Kuipers and Matzen 2008 for a similar comparison in ten EU countries).

3. *The relations between a state's security system and its citizens.* It is conventional wisdom among disaster scholars that a crisis or disaster cannot be managed by the state alone

(Rodriguez, Dynes and Quarantelli, 2006). An effective response requires cooperation between response organizations and citizens (those who suffer from a crisis or disaster as well as the citizens lucky enough to have escaped adversity). The relation between state and citizen has shifted in recent decades. The Cold War era was characterized by a dominant state with limited, prescribed roles for citizens in the civil protection structure. In more recent years, the state has shifted responsibility for safety and security back to the citizens (resilience has become a buzzword in policy circles) – even if citizens are increasingly looking to the state to protect them from new types of disasters (Beck, 1992). We will seek to typify this relation using at least four variables: expectations (what are the legally prescribed roles for citizens in a disaster?); trust (what is the level of trust in response organizations?); information (how does the state inform citizens about impending and unfolding crises and disasters?); education (how are citizens prepared for risks and disasters?).

4. *The role of the private sector in maintaining civil security*. Civil security used to be the exclusive domain of the state. The privatisation of public infrastructures has changed all that. In many countries, critical infrastructures are owned or operated by private parties; ownership structures cross geographical and functional boundaries. This creates intriguing questions for civil security (Roe and Schulman, 2008; Schulman et al, 2004), as recently evidenced by the Volcanic Ash Crisis and the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. We will map for each selected region and country how responsibilities with regard to disaster prevention, response and recovery are formally divided. We will study if and how private parties are included in national disaster preparedness exercises and consequence management. In addition, we will check if and how public government employs private parties to generate new security tools and technological innovations, and whether some of the national security reforms are driven by technological innovations instead of tactical and strategic needs per se.

Mapping of regional security architectures: The selection of cases

This project will precisely describe regional security "architectures". It will thus deliver an empirically rich database of country and regional "profiles" that enable policy stakeholders to understand the diverse patterns of cooperation capacities and assess how that capacity can be put to use.

Our selection method consists of a two-pronged strategy. First, we will select a number of geographic regions in which we expect national civil security systems to be fairly similar when mapped on the four analytical dimensions described above. Based on existing studies and expertise in the consortium, we have strong reasons to believe that the Nordic countries (Sweden, Finland) share core similarities in cultural context, legal constraints, role of society, and participation of industry (Kuipers and Matzen 2008). We know that security systems in the British Isles (UK and Ireland) also display similar characteristics. Southeastern Europe (including Serbia, and Croatia) evolved in similar historical trajectories and exhibit similar characteristics. The same holds for the Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia). Fewer similarities bind together the Visegrad countries (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia), Western and Central Europe (Germany, Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Austria, Romania) and the Mediterranean (Italy, Malta). All these assumptions must be tested and evaluated to reveal key national features, to facilitate comparison, and to reveal how regional civil security architectures are emerging. After 22/07/2011, there is a strong interest in the Civil Security system in Norway. A desk study of Norway will thus be carried out and integrated into the analysis.

Second, we will identify and map existing formal regional sub-systems of which many European countries are part (some of these associations are funded and/or supported by the EU or the UN-ISDR) (Cottey, 2000; Bailes and Cottey, 2006). Examples include the Mediterranean Southern European Cooperative Initiative (SECI); the Visegrad group; the Central European Initiative (CEI); the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS); Nordic, tri-Baltic and a five-plus-three cooperation framework; the Baltic Sea States Subregional Cooperation (BSSSC); and the Disaster

Preparedness and Prevention Initiative – South Eastern Europe (DPPI SEE). Apart from these, there are other bilateral and multilateral agreements on civil security cooperation. Surprisingly little analytical research has been done on these regional sub-systems; there is some descriptive work, but not much of analysis. We will map and analyze these subsystems (making use of existing research), and compare them in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

Identification of key informants for semi-structured interviews in mapping civil security systems in countries and regions

The identification of 'key informant' interview partners follows several overlapping considerations. Each of the national case studies (in ANVIL beneficiary countries) requires interviews with practitioners and experts for each of the three clusters: role of the private sector, relations between citizens and the state civil security system, legal/constitutional aspects of the security system. Regional case studies will follow similar considerations, but may be more limited in scope and mainly focus on operational activities of those regional associations (whereas citizens expectations may, for instance, not be pronounced).

Interview partners would be contacted on the basis of their current job position, or established professional or academic record. Therefore, a first round of interview partners will be identified on the basis of desk research. Subsequent round of interviews are likely to take place through personal referrals and recommendations. Each potential interview partner will be presented with an informed consent form and given the option to "speak off the record" or cross-check the interview protocol after the interview has been concluded.

While it cannot be ruled out that the consortium will not be granted access to all relevant actors (particularly if the military plays a role in civil security provision), we expect robust participation to cover each national system in sufficient depth to allow structured and valid comparisons. At this stage, the consortium does not envisage the use of alternative methods to semi-structured expert interviews. In case of need, however, it may be determined that supportive instruments, such as voluntary online surveys, may be employed.

The project will not work with randomized samples or positive incentives for study participants.

In order to map the legal and constitutional aspects of a civil security system, each consortium partner will conduct interviews with civil servants in national ministries as well as senior planners or advisors (or advisory boards) that shape national security strategies and contingency plans. The number of principal institutions and committees that will be contacted depends on the coordination system in each country.

Analysing the role of the private sector requires contacts and representatives from the leading professional associations, business actors and civil servant that deal with public private partnerships (at the national level).

In the area of citizen-state relations, interviews would be conducted with political representatives at various levels (e.g. from a responsible national parliamentary committee but also from regional or local government). Furthermore, we will approach civil servants or professionals in charge of citizen outreach activities. Identified "signature crises" for each country or region under investigation are likely to highlight which communities and interest groups are especially pertinent for wider questions of social trust in civil security systems.

Because of difficulties in obtaining national ethics approvals in non-beneficiary countries, studies in these countries will be confined to the desk top and thus will not include semi-structured interviews with key informants. Interviews will only occur where ethics approvals have been secured, and the research will not commence until these approvals have been obtained.

The importance of assessing the quality of existing systems: Towards interoperability

As nation states are increasingly confronted with so-called transboundary crises and disasters (Boin, 2009; Rhinard, 2009; Ansell et al 2010), their security systems must interact in an effective and timely manner. The inter-operability of national systems and capacities must improve. The ESRIF calls for "trans-European cooperation" through such means as shared standards, certification, common rules and procedures (ESRIF 2009:36). The EU Internal Security Strategy argues strongly that national governments must continuously strive to develop common standards "so that national borders, differing legislation, different languages and ways of working do not impede progress in preventing cross-border crime" (ISS 2010). Such cooperation does not come naturally (Lagadec 2009; Rhinard, 2009). The European Union institutions have played an important role in facilitating budding efforts to reach such types of transboundary cooperation (see Boin, Ekengren and Rhinard 2009). An enhanced understanding of what works (and what doesn't) for particular types of risks, crises and disasters will allow the EU to expand this role and work towards enhanced interoperability between Member States.

In addition, it is important to understand the links between local, national, regional and European levels of governance. Because Europe and its critical infrastructures are highly interdependent, a major crisis is likely to cut across these levels (affecting multiple levels along varying geographical and functional dimensions). If the links between these levels of civil security cooperation are not properly understood, the chances of prolonged disturbances, higher costs and legitimacy losses become more real.

Comparison of call text and ANVIL project developments
The objectives of the call text for SEC-2011.6.1-1 are covered on the left hand side of the table below. On the right-hand side, in the corresponding row, we provide the specific ANVIL developments that cover these features of the call text.

Table of Call text requirements versus ANVIL project features

Keywords in the SEC-2011.6.1-1 Call text include:	Key features of the ANVIL project:
The objective is to explore and compare relevant cultural phenomenon and legal determinations of civil security across Europe, taking into account the existing significant differences between countries and regions.	We pay particular attention to how civil security systems are anchored in the laws and regulations of each case country; how these different societies have acted and reacted in the face of recent crises; and to what extent cultural phenomena can have played a role.
Firstly, a sample of a few diverse security regional architectures should be studied in a comparative analysis regarding the sharing of responsibilities between public and private bodies and the role that citizens play in regional security architectures.	We study the security systems in each of several countries in the different geographical regions in Europe (Nordic, British Isles, southeastern Europe, Visegrad, Baltics, Western and Central Europe and the Mediterranean) as well as regional security architectures in these regions themselves.
Secondly, it should be studied how the identified differences affect the effectiveness and efficiency of different kinds of security systems.	We develop consensus definitions of effectiveness and efficiency (in consultation with our end-user policy stakeholder advisors) and then apply them to the different country and regional security systems looked at in the project

| Expected impact: To give policy stakeholders a clear view which kind of systems that could successfully enhance the security in certain regions. The result should contribute and give EU-added value to the debate concerning "not one security fits all". | We provide specific advice, based on consensually agreed upon objective indicators and analysis, about what changes or modifications could result in improvements to the security situation in certain regions or countries where this might be desired by EU policymakers. Additionally, we have a work package (WP5) devoted to ensuring that the project gives EU-added value to the debate by including policy stakeholders, at the EU level and from the different European regions, in all steps of our civil security system analysis process. We link our findings to future research needs where possible. |

B1.2 Quality and effectiveness of the co-ordination mechanisms, and associated work plan

B.1.2.1 Overall strategy of the work plan

The overall aim of the project is to deliver useful and usable information about Europe's regional security architectures that will help EU policymakers, as well as national and even regional security authorities. To ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of this project, our strategy incorporates the following principles:

1. Collect the <u>same type of information</u> for each selected region, association and/or country.
2. Prioritize the identification and collection of <u>existing data</u> (which is vetted in terms of reliability and accuracy).
3. Collect data that provides an indication of the <u>quality</u> of civil security practices and structures.
4. Make sure the collected data is <u>useful to policymakers and disseminated to them</u>.

To service these principles, we have formulated three sub-strategies (encompassing the first five work packages) for each project pillar: design, mapping and analysis, each of which is informed by policy stakeholders. Each pillar is essential to the outcome of the project. We elaborate on these three pillars and our strategies below.

WP1: Clever design
Our project faces two major deficiencies that must be addressed before our mapping can begin. The first challenge is that available data on civil security systems is wildly different in nature and quality. The second problem is that we do not have an accepted definition of what a high-quality civil security system looks like. Our strategy is to organize a focused and intense design phase at the start of the project. Existing literature will be used to formulate a framework for design, which will be translated into a "mapping manual". We will involve experts with different backgrounds (civil security, public administration, crisis management) to make sure the proposed mapping method is feasible in all selected regions.

WPs 2 and 3: Accurate and efficient mapping
It is of crucial importance that we collect the right data in a highly cost-effective manner. Our strategy will be to first identify what the best sources of existing data are and how we can access these. We will make use of our extended network (of both practitioners and academics) to identify these data sources. In addition, it is important that all partners collect data in the same way to ensure comparability (which is necessary for the analytical phase). Part of this strategy is that we will organize several meetings (in person and using video networking) to discuss and compare data collection processes, and jointly devise solutions for emerging data-related problems.

WPs 4 and 5: EU-focused analysis, dissemination and impact
The data collection serves a higher purpose: we want to generate insights that will be of use for EU policymakers to enhance the interoperability of European security structures, in addition to being useful for national and regional policy makers across Europe. This makes the analysis of the collected data a critical phase in our project. We will draw on previous research into the growing role of the EU and the existing constraints on developing EU crisis and disaster management capacities. This will provide us with a clear overview of the needs at the EU level. In addition, we will create a policy stakeholder group in WP5 to inform and provide feedback to our work, and who can ultimately validate our findings and function as an additional avenue for dissemination of ANVIL results during the project.

Finally, WP6 is for overall dissemination, both during and after the project, and WP7 is for project management.

B1.2.2 Timing of work packages and their components

WP	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1		MS2	MS3			d1.1a						D1.1												
						MS6																		
2						MS7	MS9					d2.1a					MS19	D2.1						
												MS14						MS21						
3								MS10	MS11			d3.1a	MS17				MS20	D3.1						
																		MS22						
4												MS15		d4.1a					MS24	D4.1			MS26	D4.2
5			MS4		MS5						MS12	d5.1a		MS18				d5.1b			MS25			D5.1
											MS13													
6						d6.1a						d6.1b							D6.1					D6.2
												d6.2a						d6.2b						
7	MS1	D7.1		D7.4		D7.2												D7.3			D7.5			
						MS8						MS16						MS23						MS27

Key

dx.xn	Interim Deliverable
MSx	Milestone
Dx.x	Final Deliverable

1.2.3 Description of significant risks, and associated contingency plans

Significant risks: As with any project breaking new ground and requiring collaboration of many partners to achieve a desired result, there are a number of risks that must be dealt with that are associated with not making the progress that is anticipated. In our case, though we have been careful to frame our expected achievements in terms that are not overly ambitious, and all consortium partners have been recruited by virtue of their demonstrated enthusiasm for the topic and their proven ability to follow through on collaborative research projects, with many having extensive experience in EU projects. The risk that the coordinator or one of the partners will underperform is therefore considered to be minimal. However, there is of course some chance that we will encounter major difficulties in one area or another. Probably the major risk in this project is that the results that we produce in our comparisons of civil security systems in countries and in regions do not turn out to be of sufficient value to policy stakeholders and do not add materially to the debate on 'not one security fits all'. In order to minimize this risk we have included a work package (WP5) specifically devoted to including policy stakeholders in all phases of our investigations.

In terms of anticipating time-consuming problems, if they should arise, and how they can be resolved in order to meet the time span allocated, we expect that the greatest potential difficulties will be in the first phases of the project. This would include getting obtaining the necessary national level ethical approvals, especially in countries that are not represented by a consortium member but are of interest for inclusion in the study, as well as identifying and involving the appropriate key informants. We have allotted ample time at the start to get these issues squared away, and our use of 'interim deliverables' will be an effective means of monitoring progress in the different tasks and work packages, as well as identifying and addressing potential problems as early as possible.

Contingency plan: Though this is a rather short project at 24 months, as a contingency in case we find early on (that is to say at the 2nd consortium meeting at month 6) that some or all of our results are not acceptable to the Project Officer in Brussels or to the policy stakeholder advisors to the project, then we will produce a written plan of how we can address the identified problem or problems and that will include a revised work plan for carrying out the remainder of the project.

In the event that we find early on that a particular ethics approval or key informant involvement in a country is causing undue delay, then we will look at possible alternative case study countries as backups so that the overall objectives of the project can still be met within the scheduled project period.

B2.   Implementation

B2.1   Management structure and procedures

In order to support the efforts of the Consortium in the most efficient and flexible way, the management structure of the project will contain the following:

Coordinator
General Assembly
Advisory Board

The project management is designed to ensure a coherent scientific, administrative and financial coordination of the project, while providing the participants with the support and tools required for establishing a reliable overall organization supporting the completion of the objectives. To supervise

the implementation of the full scope of activities envisaged, a specific managerial structure has been designed. It is composed of the Project Coordinator, the General Assembly and an Advisory Board.

Coordinator
The coordinator is the administrative manager of the project and will also contribute to the scientific management (The scientific lead of the project is Prof. Arjen Boin of Utrecht University, and the second lead is Dr. Mark Rhinard from the Swedish Institute of International Affairs). The coordinating person is Dr. James P. Rydock. The coordinator represents the consortium externally and is the intermediary between the Commission and the consortium partners. The coordinator is charged with periodically reporting work progress both to the Commission and to the consortium.

General Assembly
The General Assembly is charged with ensuring the satisfactory scientific and administrative progress of the project. This consists in quality control and risk management throughout all stages of the project. The General Assembly will advise and assist the coordinator in practical and scientific project management matters, as well as help to prepare and participate in the Commission's periodic reviews of the project. The General Assembly will participate in maintaining the overall structure and direction of the project and will be responsible for resolving disputes between participants. The General Assembly will consist of the lead member from each of the consortium full partners. The coordinator will be responsible for leading the General Assembly.

A Consortium Agreement (based on the DESCA Simplified FP7 Model Consortium Agreement, see www.DESCA-FP7.eu) will set out the detailed management, coordination and assignment of duties to the participants within the Consortium. The agreement will also cover the detailed arrangements pertaining to intellectual property issues.

Advisory Board
The Advisory Board will be a primary instrument for ensuring that the project's deliverables are of high quality and are relevant for the intended user groups. They stakeholders by virtue of the fact that they are by and large civil security system practitioners themselves as well as experts that can influence the formation of civil security policy both today and in the future. Advisory Board members will be invited to project meetings as appropriate, both to provide input about what we want to do and feedback about what we have done through the course of the ANVIL project.

End-User Advisors:
- **Michalis Ketsilidis**, Secretariat General of the European Commission, Crisis Management Unit, SG/B/3.
- **Helena Lindberg**, Director General, Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (see attached letter of support).
- **Mr. Predrag Maric**, Head of Sector of Emergency Management, Serbia.
- **Dr. Zoran Jeftic**, State Secretary in Ministry of Defence, Serbia (see attached letter of support).
- **Dr. Grzegorz Golebiowski** Deputy Director, Bureau of Research, Chancellery of the Sejm, Poland. (See support letter at end of project description).
- **Timo Härkönen**, Director of Government Security, Prime Minister´s Office, Finland.
- **Giuseppe Cucci**, Lieut. Gen. (Ret) Italian Army, Scientific coordinator Laboratory of Politics and International Economy (Nomisma- Bologna).
- **Dr. Vit Stritecky**, Research Fellow Institute of International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic (see attached letter of support).
- **Mr. Vasilleios Gkrizis**, Director, KEMEA Centre for Security Studies, Athens, Greece (see attached letter of support).
- **Prof. Antonio Padoa Schioppa**, President, Centre for Studies on Federalism, Moncalieri, Italy (see attached letter of support).
- **Mr. Jordi Vaquer i Fanes**, Director, Barcelona Centre for International Affairs, Spain (see attached letter of support).
- **Ms. Maja Bjelos**, Centre for Civil-Military Relations, Belgrade (see attached letter of support).

Other Advisors:
- May Thorseth, Ph.D., is Professor of Applied Ethics at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim. She will advise the ANVIL project on ethical issues.

Security Screeners
The following group of European security experts will assess the security sensitivity of all ANVIL deliverables:

- Paul van Musscher, Vice-Chief of Haaglanden (The wider The Hague area). Before he assumed this position, he was District Chief in Gouwe Ijssel and Leiden-Voorschoten. He holds an Executive Master of Public Administration (School for Police Leadership). Paul van Musscher has extensive experience with the management of public disorder and crisis management.

- Mr. Emilio Delfini, Officer at the Military Advisor's Office within the Secretariat of the Italian Government. Leut. Emilio Delfini works since 2002 at the Italian Prime Minister Military Advisor's Office. Previously he worked at the Information Technology Systems Acquisition Office at Italian Air Force Logistic Command, after work experiences at NATO Head Quarter and Italian Foreign Ministry. He graduated at Italian Air Force Academy, than obtained a MSc in Diplomatic and International Studies at University of Trieste. He also had training experiences in relevant security and technology institutions in UK, France and Germany.

- Johnny Engell-Hansen, General Secretariat, EU Situation Centre, Council of the European Union. Johnny Engell-Hansen joined the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union in 1994 and is currently Head of Operations Unit in the EU Situation Centre. The Unit's areas of responsibility include; monitoring and assessing world-wide events on a 24/7 basis and alerting senior EU officials and EU Member States to politically significant events; Open Sources Intelligence capability; deployable teams to ensure strategic information in a crisis situation; provision of core infrastructures (human and material) to support EU decision-making in case the EU Emergency and Crisis Coordination Arrangements are triggered; and implementation of IT platforms to optimise information exchange between the EU Situation Centre and its customers/partners in EU institutions, EU Member States and other international organizations.

2.1.1 Management Procedures

Meetings
Official project meetings for the full consortium will be held every 6 months through the course of the 24-month; each Work Package will meet additionally, as necessary, if scientific results require further discussion. According to sustainability and CO_2 reduction criteria further telephone conferences are planned according to the demands of the implementation of the project.

B2.2   Beneficiaries

1. Research Management AS (Resman)

Based in Trondheim, Norway, Research Management is an SME specializing in initiating, organizing and carrying out international collaborative research projects and exploiting their results so that the best societal value for public research investments can be achieved. Formed in 2007, the company has expertise in the general areas of security, technology development, global change, sustainability and the built environment.

Role in project: overall project coordination and administrative management; primary responsibility for dissemination and exploitation (leading WP6 and WP7); country study of Norway, assisting with regional studies and comparisons

Key personnel:
- James Rydock has a Bachelor's Degree in Physics (1985) from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a Master's Degree in Meteorology (1989), also from MIT, and a Ph.D. in Environmental Engineering (1993). Dr. Rydock had postdoctoral appointments at the Norwegian Institute for Air Research and the Building Materials and Technology Group at the Dept. of Civil and Transport Engineering at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). He has close to 20 years' experience in managing national and international research projects, nine of these years while working at the Norwegian Building Research Institute (NBI), now SINTEF Building and Infrastructure. Dr. Rydock has authored or co-authored approximately 30 papers in international refereed journals and conference proceedings. Journals include *Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, *Building and Environment*, *Atmospheric Environment, Indoor and Built Environment, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, American Industrial Hygiene Association Journal* and *Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine,* among others. He gained experience with all phases of EU project development and management as a project scientist and then work package leader in the FP5 large integrating project CabinAir. Dr. Rydock is currently the coordinator of a four year FP7 Security Programme Collaborative Project entitled 'Designing Safer Urban Spaces' (DESURBS, contract number 261652), which started in January 2011.

2. Utrecht University

Utrecht University is the oldest university in the Netherlands. It is a research university comprising of seven faculties which collectively span the entire academic spectrum in teaching and research. Founded in 1636, the University is now a modern, leading institute enjoying a growing international reputation. In the Shanghai Ranking, Utrecht University ranks 1st in the Netherlands, 11th in Europe and 50th worldwide.

The Utrecht University School of Governance (USG) is part of the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance. Scholars in USG study public organizations and their interaction with the social and administrative environment. This may concern public organizations such as government institutions, but also private organizations with public duties such as hospitals, housing corporations and service companies. The USG is especially interested how public organizations relate to the European Union. The USG's academic research has an excellent reputation, both nationally (ranked number one in the Netherlands) and internationally. In 2008, the international assessment panel qualified the USG research as 'very good' to 'excellent'.

Role in project: Leadership of WP1; Scientific coordination of project; country study of The Netherlands.

Key personnel:

- Arjen Boin has a Bachelor's, Master's Degree and Ph.D. in Public Administration (all from Leiden University, the Netherlands). Dr. Boin is a professor of Public Governance and Crisis Management at the Utrecht University School of Governance. He was the director of the Leiden University Crisis Research Center, a founding director of Crisisplan and the founding director of the Stephenson Disaster Management Institute at Louisiana State University. Professor Boin participated in the Crimson project (PASR 2004) and now participates in the Indigo project (FP7). He is the editor of *Public Administration*, a leading journal in the field. He has published extensively on topics of crisis management (at the national level and within the EU) and societal resilience.

Selected relevant publications

Boin, R.A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E. and Sundelius, B. (2005) *The Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership Under Pressure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (translated into Spanish, Chinese and Serbian). Winner of the Hugo Raab Memorial Award 2006, National Defence College, Stockholm. Co-winner of the 2007 Herbert A. Simon Best Book Award of the American Political Science Association.

Comfort, L.K., Boin, R.A., and Demchak, C. (Eds.) (2010) *Designing Resilience: Preparing for Extreme Events*, Pittsburgh University Press.

Boin, R.A. and Magnus Ekengren (2009) "Preparing for the World Risk Society: Towards a New Security Paradigm for the European Union", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Volume 17, Number 4.

Boin, R.A. and Rhinard, M. (2008) "Crisis Management in Europe: What role for the Union?", *International Studies Review*, volume 10, pp. 1-26.

Boin, R.A., Ekengren, M. and Rhinard, M. (2006) "Protecting the Union: Analyzing an emerging policy space", *Journal of European Integration*, volume 28, number 5, December, pp. 405-421.

3. Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI)
The Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) was founded in l938 as a politically independent organisation providing information, analysis and research on global political issues. The Institute has an important function as a forum for debate on international issues and as a meeting place for both academics and practitioners, journalists and politicians. The Institute publishes a number of periodicals, fact sheets and books in Swedish as well as research papers, policy papers, and policy briefs in English. The Institute's thematic research programs include "Europe", "Russia", "East Asia", "Globalization" and "Defence, Security and Development". UI disseminates its research findings through publications, seminars and participation in international networks. UI also offers expertise and training for the general public based on academic research and operates a library on international relations and foreign policy issues.

Role in project: Leadership of WP2; Scientific coordination of project; country study of Sweden.

Key personnel:

- Mark Rhinard is Senior Research Fellow and Coordinator of the Europe Research Program at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. His expertise covers the institutional processes and politics of the European Union (EU) with a special focus on internal, external, and "homeland" security policymaking in Europe. He co-directs a major research program on the European Union's growing cooperation in the area of internal security and crisis management, funded by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency. Dr. Rhinard serves as an external advisor to the European Policy Centre (EPC) in Brussels and teaches regularly at Stockholm area universities. He participates in an EU funded project on "US and EU Security Strategies" as part of a transatlantic consortium. Trained in comparative politics, Mark earned his MPhil and PhD from Cambridge University and took up positions as a tutorial fellow at Oxford University and a postdoctoral fellow at Leiden University before assuming his current post. His recent book, titled *Framing Europe: the Policy Shaping Strategies of the European Commission*, will be published by Martijn Nijhoff Publishers in 2010.
- Erik Brattberg is a Research Assistant with the Europe Research Programme at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm. His work there includes research on European Security and Defence Policy and transatlantic security cooperation. Mr. Brattberg's previous experience includes work for the Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations (New York), European Council on Foreign Relations, Global Public Policy Institute (Berlin), Hudson Institute (Washington, DC), International Center for Terrorism Studies (Washington, DC), Folke Bernadotte Academy (Sweden), and Life and Peace Institute (Sweden). Erik Brattberg holds an M.A. and B.A. in Political Science from Uppsala University. He has also attended the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy as a visiting graduate student.

4. University of Essex (UEssex)

The University of Essex is one of the UK's leading academic institutions. Founded in 1964 when it opened its doors to a cohort of just 122 students at Wivenhoe Park in Colchester, the University has grown in both reputation and size, developing a worldwide reputation for top quality teaching and research. There are now more than 9,000 students, studying at three campuses across Essex. Academic departments span the humanities, social sciences, science and engineering, and law and management. Essex is the UK's most internationally diverse campus university, with students drawn from 130 countries. In the 2008 national assessment Essex was ranked ninth out of 159 universities and colleges for the quality of its research - and top in the social sciences - while the quality of teaching was ranked eighth in the UK in the 2008 *Sunday Times University Guide.* The Faculty of Social Sciences is one of Europe's leading centres for theory-driven empirical research in the social sciences, renowned for its scholarly work, its teaching, its engagement with public debates and agendas, and its extensive training and data resources.

Role in project: Leadership of WP5; country studies of UK, Ireland and Malta.

Key personnel:
- Emil J. Kirchner has a Bachelor's Degree in Economics, a Master's Degree in Comparative Politics and a Ph.D in International Politics (all from Case Western Reserve University, USA). Prof. Kirchner is Jean Monnet Professor of European Political Integration, and Coordinator of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence at the University of Essex, He was the founding Director of the Centre for European Studies at the University of Essex. Professor Kirchner has obtained Fellowships from the European University Institute (Florence) and NATO, has held several visiting professorships in Europe, the USA and China, has been awarded the Order of Merit from the Federal Republic of Germany, and has become an Academician of the Association of Social Sciences in the UK. He was a member of the European Studies Panel for the British Research Assessment Exercise, and was a coordinating member of the FP-6 Garnet project. Professor Kirchner has published over 60 books and refereed articles, primarily in the area of European and global security governance, European political integration, and European energy cooperation.
- Han Dorussen is professor of Government at the University of Essex and currently Head of the Department of Government. He has a Bachelor's and Master's Degree in Political Science, specialisation Research Methods, from the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and received his Ph.D. in Government, specialisation Formal Theory and International Relations, from the University of Texas at Austin. He has been a lecturer at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Trondheim, Norway, and has been a visiting professor at the University of Konstanz, Germany. He is associate editor for the Journal of Peace Research. He has been a member of the FP-5 DOSEI project as well as the ESF/ESRC GrowNet project, while current research on peacekeeping is funded by the Folke Bernadotte Academy. He has published on the relationship between trade and conflict, the use of economic policies in international politics, peacekeeping operations and the governance of post-conflict societies, and policy convergence in the European Union.

Selected relevant publications:

Emil J. Kirchner, CSDP Peace Operations in the Western Balkans: impact and lessons learned, *European Security,* forthcoming.
Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling, eds, National Security Cultures: Patterns of Global Governance, Routledge, 2010.
Emil J. Kirchner and Can Berk, 'European Energy Security Cooperation: between Amity and Enmity', Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 48, no.4 (September 2010), 859-880.
Han Dorussen, Emil J. Kirchner and James Sperling, ' Sharing the Burden of Collective Security in the European Union, *International Organization*, 63:4 (Fall 2009), pp. 789-810.
Han Dorussen and Hugh Ward, 'Inter Governmental Organizations and the Kantian Peace: *A* Network Perspective', Journal of Conflict Resolution, 52 (2), April 2008, 189-212.

5. The Institute for International Relations (IMO)

The Institute for International Relations (IMO) is a public, non-profit, scientific policy research organization, established in 1963. IMO's mission is to provide strategic decision support related to relevant development policies from point of view of the EU accession process. Its main fields of expertise are: European integration process, security issues; economic development and competitiveness; regional and local development; environmental policy and nature protection; energy policy and climate changes, strategic planning and management in public administration on the central, regional and local level. IMO's experts are transferring their knowledge and experience to other countries in the region. IMO undertakes research, education and information activities through: interdisciplinary scientific and policy research; organization of conferences and workshops; design and organization of specific training programmes; publication of books and reviews; dissemination of information and development of networking.

In the broader region of South-eastern Europe (SEE) IMO is a recognised partner due to numerous joint projects and other research related activates that have been implemented in cooperation with various organisations from countries of that region. Cooperation in the region of SEE contributed towards building up of IMO profile and enabled it to function as a focal point in future research related activities between countries of that region.

Role in project: Country study of Croatia, assisting with regional studies and comparisons

Potential research staff on the project
- Visnja Samardzija, PhD. Head of Department for European Integration in the Institute for International Relations – IMO, Zagreb, Croatia. Served as assistant minister in the Ministry for European Integration of the Republic of Croatia (2000-2004) and was actively involved in the accession process to the EU. Teaching at Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Zagreb and University of Osijek. Coordinated a number of international projects and conferences focused on the various aspects of the European integration process. Participated in FP6 Network of Excellence "EU Consent – Wider Europe, Deeper Integration?". Her area of interest is EU enlargement, EU policy towards the SEE and the EU accession of Croatia. She is a Board member of the Trans European Policy Study Association in Brussels (TEPSA).

- Sandro Knezovic, PhD. The scientific work of Sandro Knezovic is concentrated on international relations topics, especially those related to international and European security (CFSP/CSDP), the EU and NATO enlargement and its impact on the region of Southeast Europe. He holds a PhD in Comparative Politics on issues related to security in Southeast Europe. He is a member of various international networks and expert working groups, having a recognisable experience in teaching international relations and European integration issues in Europe and elsewhere. He was Research Fellow at the EU Institute for Security Studies in Paris and visiting professor at Osaka University, Doshisha University and Tokyo University in Japan.
- Sasa Cvrljak, MA Research Assistant at the Department for European Integration at IMO. He graduated Political Science at the Zagreb University and holds a Master degree in International Relations and European Studies from the Central European University in Budapest. His scientific interests include EU external relations, regional cooperation in the EU and process of political and economic consolidation in the post-socialist states in Europe.
- Sanja Tisma, PhD is Director of the Institute for International Relations (since 2009) and Head of IMO Resource Economics and Environmental Policy Department. She took her doctorate in economics. She has 22 years of professional experience as a scientist, project manager, particularly in the field of sustainable development, environmental economics and environmental policy, public administration and human resources management. Ms. Tisma coordinated or participated in national and international multidisciplinary research projects in the field of economics and environment. She is a lecturer at the Faculty of Economics and at the College for Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.

6. Hellenberg International (HI)

Hellenberg International Limited was founded in Tampere in 1976, and is an internationally recognised single-source project design house, specialising in critical infrastructure protection (CIP) projects. Over more than 30 years Hellenberg has established a successful record in conducting government and corporate contracts focussed on anti-terrorism and the management of natural disasters and other asymmetric threats. Hellenberg has developed pioneering assessment and operational exercises and employs systematic project management tools that establish agreed milestones, identify concrete deliverables and produce measureable outcomes through commitment, clarity and accountability. The senior advisers at Hellenberg International are drawn from a wide variety of successful professional careers including military, diplomatic and academic realms. Members of our team have headed diplomatic missions in highly turbulent regions, conducted crisis management operations and chaired multinational UN task forces.

Role in project: Country studies of Finland, Estonia, Luthuania and Latvia, assisting with regional studies and comparisons

Key personnel:

- Dr Timo Hellenberg is an Executive Director of Hellenberg International. He started as a researcher at the United Nations Department for Humanitarian Affairs (International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction). The other assignments in this field include researcher at the University of Tampere and at the University of Helsinki. Other assignments: Project Director: The Northern Dimension Advisory Network: 1/2003 – 5/2005, EU Interreg IIIA. Project Partner: Eurobaltic Civil Protection I, 3/03-3/06, EU Interreg IIIB. Project Partner: Eurobaltic Civil Protection II, 9/07-12/07, Interreg IIIB. Project Partner: Civil Protection Early Warning, 1/07-12/07, EU DG Environment. Project Partner: Critical Infrastructure Protection, 1/07-12/07, EU DG JHL. Project Partner: Protecting Adriatic Seaways, 12/07-12/08, EU DG JHL., Project Director: Poseidon – Preventing Terrorism, 12/07-11/08, EU DG JHL. Project Director: Aether - Air Passenger Transport Security in Case of CBRN Threat by Terrorists, 3/09-3/11, EU DG JHL. Grants: US State Department 2007, US State Department 2006, US State Department 2005, Finnish Ministry of Defence (MATINE) December 2003, Finnish Ministry of Defence (MATINE) March 2002, August Ramsay Foundation February 1997.

- Hilleke van Osch – holds a Master of Economics from the University of Western Australia and a BEc (Hons) from Murdoch University in Western Australia. She has worked as a policy advisor for the Department of Health Western Australia in the areas of strategic planning, health service development and contract management. She has written and presented research papers at conferences in Australia and is currently working as an independent researcher and project coordinator.

- Pekka Visuri, Dr. Pol. Sc. is a retired Army Colonel, and has worked 15 years as a scientist. He is adjunct professor at the National Defence University in Helsinki, specialized in security policy and strategy. His latest publications include *Finland in the Cold War*. (Helsinki: Otava, 2006), *Guidelines for the Finnish Security and Defence Policy*, (Helsinki: Otava, 2003) and *Finland and Crises*, (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 2003). Dr Visuri is well known and widely acknowledged military and security policy expert.

Selected relevant publications:

Hellenberg, Timo and Visuri, Pekka: Air Passenger Transport Safety in case of CBRN terrorism, Final publication for the EC DG Home Affairs, WSOY 2010.

Hellenberg, Timo: Information Technologies and Decision Support Systems in Civil Protection, Report for the Council of the Baltic Sea States, Eurobaltic Publications, Helsinki 2006.

Hellenberg, Timo: Regionalisation of the Rescue Services, Report for the Council of the Baltic Sea States, Eurobaltic Publications, Helsinki 2006.

Hellenberg, Timo; Pursiainen, Christer & Kivelä, Hanna-Mari: Finnish Defence Forces and Homeland Security (Puolustusvoimat ja sisäinen turvallisuus), Maanpuolustuksen Tieteellinen Neuvottelukunta (MATINE), 2004.

7. Istituto Affari Internazionali (I.A.I.)

The Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) was founded on 11 October 1965 on the initiative of Altiero Spinelli, who became its first Director. IAI is a non-profit organization funded by individual and corporate members, public and private organizations, major international foundations, and through a standing order from the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Institute is one of the major Italian think tanks in the fields of foreign policy, security and defence issues and international political economics. IAI has accumulated a strong background in the security and defence field over the last 40 years and since PASR 2004 has been active in several European projects regarding the political, economic, industrial and technological aspects of security and defence (in progress: http://www.iai.it/sections_en/ricerca/difesa_sicurezza/difesa_sicurezza.asp and concluded: http://www.iai.it/sections_en/ricerca/difesa_sicurezza/progetti_chiusi.asp).

Role in project: Leadership of WP3; country study of Italy

Key personnel:
-Stefano Silvestri has been President of I.A.I. since 2001. He has been a lead writer for Il Sole 24 Ore since 1985. Between January 1995 and May 1996 he served as Under Secretary of State for Defence, having been an advisor to the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, for European matters, in 1975, and a consultant to the Prime Minister's Office under various governments. He continues to act as a consultant to both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministries of Defence and Industry. He was Professor for Mediterranean Security Issues at the Bologna Centre of Johns Hopkins University (1972-76), and has worked at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London (1971-1972). He is currently a member of administrative council of the Associazione Industrie per l'Aerospazio, i Sistemi a la Difesa, (AIAD), and of the Trilateral Commission.
-Federica Di Camillo Senior Fellow in the Security and Defence Area, her work concerns the institutional aspects of European security and defence politics and of the defence market. Since 2005 she has been involved in the analysis and the networking of security programmes related to problems of security at both the national and European levels, with particular regard to security strategies and institutional developments, capacity, international terrorism and non-conventional arms, societal security. A jurist by education, she graduated from the La Sapienza University in Rome, she has studied at the Université Panthéon-Assas in Paris, and has completed internships at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs (Disarmament and Arms Control Office, Non-Proliferation) and at the Defence Commission of the Parliamentary Assembly of the UEO (Paris).
-Nicolo' Sartori is Junior Researcher at the I.A.I., where he is working on projects focused on the evolution of technologies in the public safety and security domain. He also conducts research on the emerging threats towards critical infrastructure in civilian environments. He is currently a Ph.D student in International Relations at the University of Kent. He holds a BA in International and Diplomatic Studies and an MA in International Relations from the University of Bologna - Forlì.
-Alessandro Marrone Researcher in the Security & Defence Area, he has obtained in 2009 a Masters in International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Previously he has worked at IAI in both Transatlantic Relations and Security & Defence Areas. He holds a BA degree in Political Science and a MSc degree in International Relations from the LUISS Guido Carli University in Rome, in both cases with first class honours. He is interested in European security and defence policy, the relations between industry, technological innovation and security/defence, NATO and US foreign policy. He currently collaborates with several Italian magazines and webmagazines, including: AffarInternazionali, Aspenia online, Risk.
-Ettore Greco is Director of the IAI and editor of the institute's journal *The International Spectator*. He heads the transatlantic program of the IAI. He worked as visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution from January 2006 to July 2007. He taught at the universities of Parma and Bologna. From 2000 to 2006 he worked as correspondent for the Economist Intelligence Unit. From 1993 to 2000 he directed the IAI's program on Central and Eastern Europe. He was also Deputy Director of the IAI from 1997 to 2008. He is the author of a number of publications on the EU's institutions and foreign policy, transatlantic relations and the Balkans. He has been a free-lance journalist since 1988.

8. Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy

The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy is an independent research institution at the University of Hamburg. The IFSH was established as a civil-law foundation in 1971 following a recommendation of the German Science Council ("Wissenschaftsrat") to promote peace-related research and currently employs around 50 people. The IFSH's research profile demonstrates an awareness of political realities, a focus on problem solving, and an international mix of staff and project partners. The IFSH is divided into three specialized research units. The **Centre for European Peace and Security Studies (ZEUS)** focuses on the theoretical and practical aspects of the European Union's efforts to strengthen peace and security both within and beyond Europe. The **Centre for OSCE Research (CORE)** is the world's first research institute dedicated to studying the work of the OSCE in the areas of conflict regulation, system transformation and democratisation. The **Interdisciplinary Research Group on Disarmament, Arms Control, and Risk Technologies (IFARª)** applies the expertise the institute has gathered over decades in the area of arms-control policy to new security-policy challenges arising from technology in general and military technology in particular. The institute provides governments, parliaments, international organisations and other key political actors with services based on its academic knowledge, policy expertise and regional know-how.

Role in project: Leadership of WP4; country studies of Germany, Austria and Switzerland

Key personnel:

- Dr.Raphael Bossong is a researcher at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. He holds a BA in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge and a Masters and PhD in International Relations from the London School of Economics. His PhD thesis on the historical evolution of EU counterterrorism policy was supported by the UK Economic and Social Research Council. From 2006 to 2008 he served as a researcher for the FP6 project "Challenge: Liberty & Security" and taught related seminars on international and European security policy at the LSE and King's College London. From 2008 to 2010 he was research associate at the Global Public Policy Institute, Berlin, where he mainly analysed the EU civilian crisis management and rule of law missions. Aside from a series of working papers on different aspects of EU security policy, he recently published on the EU's fight against terrorism in the Journal of Common Market Studies (2008), and on the link between public administration and EU civilian crisis management in the European Journal for Public Policy (2010).

- Hendrik Hegemann, MA, is a PhD candidate at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. His dissertation project assesses the role of international organizations as actors in post-9/11 security cooperation based on different theories of international relations and comparative empirical case studies on the European Union and the United Nations. The project which shall be completed by the end of 2011 is supported by the Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation. In addition, he has worked and published on EU security governance in the context of the fight against terrorism and co-authored an article on the political determinants of counter-terrorism policy that was recently accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. He holds a Master's degree in Political Science from the University of Freiburg and spent one year as an exchange student in the United States at the University of Washington, Seattle.

9. The Swedish National Defence College (SNDC)

The Swedish National Defence College (SNDC) was established as a national university college on January 1, 2008, with the right to issue academic degrees. SNDC has existed in its present form since 1997. The College's roots can be traced back as far as the establishment of the Artillery College at Marieberg in Stockholm in the 19th century. SNDC aims to be an instrument for change in the fields of Defence and Security Policy. The College's task is to contribute towards national and international security through research and development. Through the development of new knowledge and by offering education and training, the College makes an active contribution to shaping the Defence of the future, both nationally and internationally. Research is carried out in diverse, but inter-related subject areas and subsequently disseminated to interested sectors of society both nationally and internationally. The College trains and educates military and civilian personnel in leading positions, both nationally and internationally as part of the contribution to the management of crisis situations and security issues.

The SNDC is divided into three academic departments: The Department of Military Studies is responsible for War Studies, Military-Technology, Command and Control Science, and Military History. The Department of Security and Strategic Studies is responsible for Political Science with focus on Security Policy and Crisis Management, Strategy and International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law. The Department of Leadership and Management carries out research and provides education, training and consultation services in the leadership requirements for the defence of our society, concentrating on the sociological, psychological and pedagogic aspects. Research concentrates on specially selected subject areas: War Studies and Military Technology, International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law, Crisis Management and International Security and Cooperation, Leadership, Command and Control Science, Military History, Security Policy and Strategy. There are also four research centres at the college – CRISMART, the National Centre for Crisis Management Studies, CATS, the Centre for Asymmetric Threat Studies, and MTC, The Centre for Military Technology. The Programme for European Security Research (EUROSEC) focuses on European security, EU crisis management and civil protection and trans-boundary threats. The College has on several occasions participated with courses and 'modules' within the framework of the European Security Defence College.

Role in project: Helping in the country study of Sweden and studies of regional associations, comparisons, desk study of Norway after the events of 22/07/2011, desk study of Romania.

Key personnel:

- Dr Magnus Ekengren is Associate Professor at the Swedish National Defence College. He is the Director of the College's Programme for European Security Research (EUROSEC) and co-director of the international research programme *Building Societal Security in Europe.* Ekengren publishes in the areas of European foreign and security policy, crisis management, security sector reform, and the Europeanisation of the nation-state. His recent publications include articles on transboundary threats and new forms of EU co-operation (*European Security*) and the EU's new security paradigm (*Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*) and the book *The Time of European Governance* (Manchester University Press). His latest books are called *The Politics of Security Sector Reform – Challenges and Opportunities for the EU's Global Role* (Ashgate) and *The EU as Crisis Manager – Patterns and Prospects* (forthcoming). Ekengren is a former Swedish diplomat and was previously Deputy Director at the Policy Planning Unit of the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs (where he dealt with EU enlargement and institutional reform). He was the secretary for the Ministry's Group of Reference for European Affairs that brought together leading academic researchers and policymakers. Ekengren also served in the Swedish Representation to the Council of Europe, in Strasbourg, and worked in the European Commission. He studied at Uppsala University, the College of Europe in Brugge, and Johns Hopkins University (Bologna) before earning his PhD from Stockholm University.

10. Faculty of Security Studies

The **Faculty of Security Studies** is a graduate-level member institution of the University of Belgrade and belongs to the group of the humanities faculties. By its syllabus and curriculum, the Faculty covers interrelated philosophical, sociological, political, legal, economic, psychological, ethical, humanitarian, civilian-military, and other aspects of the security studies, human and social resources, defense, civil defense and environment protection. Within its core activity – the security studies, the Faculty offers basic academic and undergraduate studies, Master degree studies, doctoral, and specialist undergraduate studies, as well as professional training and education. The Faculty carries out basic scholarly, applied and development research and has been accredited as a scholarly institution by the Ministry for Science and Environment of the Republic of Serbia. More information available on the web site:

http://www.fb.bg.ac.rs/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=249&Itemid=1259

Role in project: Country study of Serbia, helping with regional studies and comparisons

Key personnel:

Želimir Kešetović PhD (1960,Sarajevo). At Faculty of Political Sciences University of Belgrade graduated (1984), finished MA (1994) and PhD (1999). Worked as analyst in Serbian Ministry of Interior (1985-1995), professor of Sociology and Criminology and head of Research and Development Unit of the Police College (1995-2005). Member of Think Tank for reform of Ministry of Interior after democratic changes in Serbia in 2000. Deputy editor of MoI journal *Bezbednost (Security)*. Assistant (2005) and associate (2009) professor of Crisis management at Faculty of Security Studies. Participated in number of conferences in Serbia and abroad. Author of more than 150 papers in domestic and foreign journals and several books. Most important for the project being: Police public relations (Police College -2000), Crisis management - Prevention (Faculty of Security Studies Belgrade - 2006),   Systems of Crisis Management (monograph - Faculty of Security Banja Luka 2008) and Crisis management university textbook (Faculty of Security Studies Belgrade - 2008) and essays in World Police Encyclopedia (Routledge -2006), Policing in emerging democracies (Faculty of Criminal Justice - 2007), Police Education and Training in a Global Society (Lexington books - 2007) i The Fight Against Terrorism and Crisis Management in the Western Balkans' (IOS Press - 2008).

11. Fondacion pour la Recherche Strategique (FRS)

The Foundation for Strategic Research is a non-profit independent think tank established in Paris since 1993. FRS is composed by a multidisciplinary team of 15 full-time researchers and a dozen associated researchers. The core missions of the Foundation for Strategic Research are:

- to carry out research on politico-military issues,

- to advise decision-makers through policy-oriented studies,

- to foster the debate on strategic issues by organizing public and closed events.

The FRS's three main study areas are:

- Technological issues and security,

- Defence and security policies and doctrines,

- The nature of crises and conflicts.

FRS has been and is still involved as a partner or as coordinator in a number of security related studies commissioned by the European Commission via the Preparatory Actions in the field of Security Research (PASR) and the Framework Programmes for Research and Development (FP6 and FP7) – for example, ASTRO+, SeNTRE, ISACPS, Europcop, STACCATO, BIO3R (as coordinator of the project), CBRNEmap, LIMES, GMOSAIC, CRESCENDO.

Role in project: country study of France, participating in regional studies and comparisons

Key personnel:
- Dr. Jean-François Daguzan. Senior Research Fellow at FRS. He is a specialist on Proliferation Issues and Terrorism and has a worldwide knowledge of Mediterranean and Middle East Countries (since 1976) and Central Asia Countries (since 1998). Dr Daguzan has a PhD in Law and in Political Science. He became a Senior Analyst at the *Secretariat général de la Défense nationale*, (SGDN), of the Prime Minister Office (General Secretary for National Defense) in 1988 to 1991. Thereafter he joined the *Centre de recherches et d'études sur les stratégies et les technologies de l'Ecole polytechnique*, CREST, (Center for research and study on strategy and technology) that merged into the FRS in 1998. Dr Daguzan is also an Associated Professor in Economics and Security Studies at the University of Paris II (Panthéon-Assas). He is also the Director of *Sécurité globale* Review.

- Jean-Luc Marret, PhD in political science, is a senior fellow at FRS since January 2001. He is a well-seasoned expert on terrorism, counter-terrorism, homeland security, with a field approach on Maghreb and Europe. Regularly in France and Europe, he is senior fellow in residence at the Center for Transatlantic Relations, SAIS-Johns Hopkins University (Washington DC) on behalf of FRS, he has recently developed a comparative transatlantic background. He is principal lecturer at the National school for Gendarmerie Officers (Course on Counter-terrorism and Jihadism operational practices, sociology and doctrines), at the special national school for firemen officers (CBRN-E terrorism). He has published 12 related books, and peer-reviewed papers, in different languages.

- Frederic Coste is a research fellow at the FSR. He is working on sociological issues (especially cooperation between military and civilian administrations during crisis). Graduated in History and Political Science, he has taken part to French and European programmes related to crisis management such as REALEX (for the French Research Agency) and BIO3R(EC PASR 2006).

- Elisande Nexon. After the State diploma of Doctor of Pharmacy awarded by the universities, she has received a master's in arms control and disarmament. She is currently a research fellow. Her main topics are biological and chemical terrorism and proliferation, as well as public health issues in the field of security. She has taken part in several European and French projects related to CBRN issues such as BIO3R (EC PASR 2006), CBRNE map (FP 7), BTSR (for the French Institute Inserm-Transfert), REALEX (for the French Research Agency).

12. Adam Mickiewicz University (AMU)

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Poland, is one of the leading institutions of higher education in Poland. It employs 357 full professors, 303 University professors and 611 senior lecturers/researchers. Over 50,000 students study 200 different programs offered by 13 faculties. The project will draw on expertise from The Institute of Sociology (of Faculty of Social Sciences) which specializes in studies of local and regional communities development; studies on risk; environmental policies studies; social work, quality of life; family; tourism; gerontology.

Role in project: Country studies of Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and Czech Republic, providing a sociological perspective and expertise on climate-change related, civil security governance issues.

Key personnel:

-Piotr Matczak, Ph.D., works for the Economic Sociology and Local Governance Research Unit in the Institute of Sociology, AMU. He was engaged in several EU funded projects (ADAM - Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies: Supporting European Climate Policy; IDARI Integrated Development of Agriculture and Rural Institutions) and is currently involved in FP7 InContext project (Individuals in Context: Supportive Environments for Sustainable Living). He works on institutional foundations of risk management; institutional analysis of social problems and public policies; social efficiency; governance issues in sustainable development of urban and rural communities; relations between society and natural resources; institutional issues and consequences of climate change; new institutionalism. He is Member of the Board of Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty Research Network of the European Sociological Association; member of the Disaster and Social Crisis Research Network of European Sociological Association; the Secretary of the Risk Studies Committee of Polish Academy of Sciences and several other scholar organizations.

Recent publications:

Otto-Banaszak I., Matczak P., Wesseler J., Wechsung F., 2010. Different perceptions of adaptation to climate change: a mental model approach applied to the evidence from expert interview, Regional Environmental Change, DOI 10.1007/s10113-010-0144-2
McEvoy D., Matczak P., Banaszak I., Choryński A., 2010. Framing adaptation to climate-related extreme events. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change, vol 15, no. 7: 779-796.
Werners, S.E., Matczak, P., Flachner, Z., 2010. Individuals matter: exploring strategies of individuals to change the water policy for the Tisza River in Hungary, Ecology and Society 15(2): 24.
Werners S., Flachner Z., Matczak P., Falaleeva M., Leemans R., 2009. Exploring earth system governance: a case study of floodplain management along the Tisza River in Hungary, Global Environmental Change 19 (4), 503-511.

B2.3 Consortium as a whole

The partners were selected partly out of a desire to obtain a good geographic coverage of Europe, and partly because of their complementary areas of expertise regarding security systems at the national, regional and European level. Istituto Affari Internazionali (I.A.I.), from Italy, bring experience from the EU-CRESCENDO project as well as a deep understanding of the Italian and Southern Mediterranean security situation. The University of Essex (UEssex), in the United Kingdom, is a well-known centre of expertise on regional security governance questions in Europe. Hellenberg International (HI), from Finland, has many years of experience studying civil security systems from a comparative perspective in Europe, and has close ties with government officials and the scholarly community. The Faculty of Security Studies at the University of Belgrade (FB), in Serbia, brings a close understanding of Balkan security cooperation on domestic civil security issues, as does the Institute for International Relations (IMO) in Croatia. Both organizations have active research agendas on supranational cooperation towards civil security and have experience in EU-funded projects. The Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy (IFSH), from Germany, offers expertise in security analysis and brings a deep understanding of the way national structures facilitate or impede security cooperation at the European and sub-European level. The Foundation for Strategic Research (FRS), from France, is an active member of European projects focused on security questions, especially complex, trans-boundary threats such as bioterrorism. The University of Utrecht (UU), in the Netherlands, is considered a European centre of expertise on domestic civil security systems analysis, including societal security and resilience questions. The Swedish National Defence College (SNDC) brings a robust understanding of new European security issues, not least the military/civilian mix of tools required in domestic civil security response. The Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) is a leading institute with specialists in supranational cooperation on "homeland" security questions. The institute has many years experience of working in EU-sponsored networks. The team from Adam Mickiewicz University (AMU) in Poland brings a sociological perspective to the mix, with research expertise in civil response and governance issues, especially associated with climate-change induced natural disasters in Poland and Hungary. Finally, RESMAN is an experienced project coordinator in the FP7 Security Programme and is committed to leading and carrying out research projects that yield the best value for the money and the highest impact in Europe and beyond.

i) Sub-contracting: None of the core work of the project is to be subcontracted. An (external) audit certificate for Resman who is the only beneficiary receiving more than 375,000€ from the Commission is budgeted as a sub-contracting post of 4000€. Additionally, partners hosting consortium meetings have been budgeted the following sub-contracting amounts for lunch catering, under article II.7.3 'Minor tasks' (see breakdown under 'Resources to be committed' below):

M6: Utrecht: 1500€
M12: Hamburg: IFO 1400€
M18: Rome: IAI 1400€
M21: Essex: UESSEX 875€
M24: Stockholm: 1875€

Finally, 5000€ is to be subcontracted by partner 2 (Utrecht) to hire Crisisplan (www.crisisplan.nl) to produce a video film of the project's main results. Crisisplan has extensive experience and is highly qualified for this type of work.

ii) Other countries: None of the countries is outside the EU or is not an Associated Country.

iii) Third party: None foreseen

B2.4 Resources to be committed

We are applying for 100% reimbursement of eligible direct costs for all partners for all activities in the project, and 7% reimbursement of eligible indirect costs. The total requested Community grant is **2,009,227€.**

The resources to be committed by each partner are summarized in the table below.

Partner	Resources to be committed to ANVIL project
1/Resman	The work will be divided between J. Rydock and other Resman staff.
2/UTRECHT	The work will be divided between A. Boin (60% FTE) and a full time graduate assistant for 24 months.
3/UI	The work will be divided between M. Rhinard (20 % FTE) and a full time research assistant for 24 months.
4/UEssex	The work will be divided between E. Kirchner and a full time graduate assistant for 24 months.
5/IMO	The work will be divided between V. Samardzija and an assistant.
6/HI	The work will be divided between T. Hellenberg and two assistants.
7/I.A.I.	The work will be divided between Stefano Silvestri, Federica Di Camillo, Nicolo' Sartori, Alessandro Marrone and Ettore Greco.
8/IFSH	The work will be divided between R. Bossong and a graduate assistant.
9/SNDC	The work will be divided between M. Ekengren (20% FTE) and two assistants at 20% FTE and 50% FTE for 24 months
10/FB	The work will be divided between Z. Kesetovic and an assistant
..11/FRS	The work will be divided between Jean-François Daguzan, Jean-Luc Marret, Frederic Coste and Elisande Nexon.
..12/AMU	The work will be divided between P. Matczak and assistants

Explanation of non-personnel costs:

Travel to consortium meetings/meeting hosting costs:

To estimate the travel/hosting costs for each partner, we have a tentative schedule of project meetings as follows:

M1: kickoff meeting, Brussels, 2 nights
M6: 2nd consortium meeting + WP1 workshop, Utrecht, 3 nights
M12: 3rd consortium meeting, Hamburg, 3 nights
M18: 4th consortium meeting, Rome, 3 nights
M21: WP5 workshop, Essex, 2 nights
M24: Final meeting: Stockholm, 3 nights

Partner 1 Resman

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	1600	250	1	1850
M6	1600	375	1	1975
M12	1550	375	1	1925
M18	1300	375	1	1675
M21	1700	375	1	2075
M24	900	375	1	1275
Sum				**10775** €

Partner 2 Utrecht

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	150	250	2	800
M6	0	0	2	0
M12	300	375	2	1350
M18	300	375	1	675
M21	300	375	1	675
M24	300	375	2	1350
Sum				**4850** €

Partner 3 UI

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	300	250	2	1100
M6	300	375	1	675
M12	350	375	2	1450
M18	250	375	1	625
M21	200	375	1	575
M24	0	0	2	0
Sum				**4425** €

Partner 4 UEssex

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	200	250	2	900
M6	200	375	2	1150
M12	300	375	1	675
M18	300	375	2	1350
M21	0	0	2	0
M24	300	375	1	675
Sum				**4750** €

Partner 5 IMO

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	510	250	1	760
M6	520	375	1	895
M12	350	375	2	1450
M18	500	375	1	875
M21	250	375	1	625
M24	300	375	2	1350
Sum				**5955** €

Partner 6 Hellenberg

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	500	250	2	1500
M6	500	375	1	875
M12	500	375	2	1750
M18	500	375	1	875
M21	300	375	1	675
M24	250	375	1	625
Sum				**6300** €

Partner 7 IAI

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	450	250	2	1400
M6	400	375	1	775
M12	400	375	1	775
M18	0	375	1	375
M21	350	375	1	725
M24	400	375	2	1550
Sum				**5600** €

Partner 8 IFSH

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	200	250	1	450
M6	200	375	1	575
M12	0	0	1	0
M18	300	375	1	675
M21	250	375	1	625
M24	250	375	1	625
Sum				**2950** €

Partner 9 SNDC

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	300	250	2	1100
M6	300	375	2	1350

M12	350	375	1	725
M18	250	375	1	625
M21	200	375	1	575
M24	0	0	2	0
Sum				**4375** €

Partner 10 FB

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	280	250	1	530
M6	280	375	1	655
M12	280	375	1	655
M18	260	375	1	635
M21	460	375	1	835
M24	240	375	1	615
Sum				**3925** €

Partner 11 FRS

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	180	250	3	1290
M6	150	375	2	1050
M12	250	375	2	1250
M18	250	375	2	1250
M21	280	375	2	1310
M24	350	375	2	1450
Sum				**7600** €

Partner 12 AMU

Meeting	Travel fare	Accomm.	# of people	
M1	180	250	1	430
M6	290	375	1	665
M12	250	375	2	1250
M18	250	375	1	625
M21	280	375	1	655
M24	350	375	2	1450
Sum				**5075** €

Hosting costs for consortium meetings/workshops:

M1: No host; each partner responsible for own lunches and dinners

M6:	20+35+20 lunches x 20€/lunch	1500€	(subcontract Utrecht)
	40 dinner x 60€/dinner	2400€	(consumable Utrecht)

M12:	20+30+20 lunches x 20€/lunch	1400€	(subcontract IFSH)
	40 dinner x 60€/dinner	2400€	(consumable IFSH)
M18:	20+30+20 lunches x 20€/lunch	1400€	(subcontract I.A.I.)
	40 dinner x 60€/dinner	2400€	(consumable I.A.I.)
M21:	35 lunches x 25€/lunch	875€	(subcontract UESSEX)
	40 dinner x 70€/dinner	2800€	(consumable UESSEX)
M24:	20+35+20 lunches x 25€/lunch	1875€	(subcontract UI)
	35 dinner x 75€/dinner	2625€	(consumable UI)

Interview expenses:

Utrecht	560 €
UI	564 €
UESSSEX	564 €
IMO	564 €
Hellenberg	564 €
IAI	564 €
IFSH	564 €
SNDC	564 €
FB	564 €
FRS	564 €
AMU	564 €
Total:	6200 €

Travel to present ANVIL results at conferences in Europe

-UESSEX:

Univ. Assoc. for Contemporary European Studies, Passau, October 2012	800€
European Consortium for Political Research, Bordeaux, September 2013	800€
-AMU: ESA conference, University of Turin, August 28th-31st, 2013	1000€

Under 'Other' (column C): For the coordinator, 'Other direct costs' include the following:

Travel costs to bringing external contributors to meetings/workshops:

-M6 Utrecht: WP1 workshop:

| Travel assistance for 20 persons x 250 euro/travel | 5000€ |
| Accommodation: 20 persons x 2 nights x 125 €/night | 5000€ |

-M12 Hamburg: public part of consortium meeting

Travel assistance for 8 persons x 250 €/travel	2000€
Accommodation: 8 persons x 2 nights x 125 €/night	2000€

-M18 Rome: public part of consortium meeting

Travel assistance for 8 persons x 250 €/travel	2000€
Accommodation: 8 persons x 2 nights x 125 €/night	2000€

-M21 Essex: WP5 workshop:

Travel assistance for 20 persons x 250 €/travel	5000€
Accommodation: 20 persons x 2 nights x 125 €/night	5000€

-M24 Stockholm: public part of consortium meeting

Travel assistance for 4 persons x 250 euro/travel	1000€
Accommodation: 4 persons x 2 nights x 125 €/night	1000€

-M13 Travel by coordinator to Brussels for mid-term evaluation	1,600€
-Travel by coordinator to security conference to disseminate ANVIL	2,000€
-M24 Travel by coordinator to Brussels for final evaluation	1,600€

Total:	**35,200**€

Under 'Other' (column C): For other partners, 'Other direct costs' include the following:

Utrecht: M13 Travel Arjen Boin to Brussels for mid-term evaluation	500€
Utrecht: M24 Travel Arjen Boin to Brussels for final evaluation	500€

UI: M13 Travel Mark Rhinard to Brussels for mid-term evaluation	600€
UI: M24 Travel Mark Rhinard to Brussels for final evaluation	600€

Under 'Management' (column B): 'Subcontracting' costs are as follows:

Audit certificate for Resman	4,000€

Video film for Utrecht (to hire Crisisplan)	5,000€

B3. Impact

B3.1 Strategic impact

The expected impact of Topic SEC-2011.6.1-1 is as follows: "To give policy stakeholders a clear view which kind of systems that could successfully enhance the security in certain regions. The result should contribute and give EU-added value to the debate concerning "not one security fits all". To achieve these impacts, our project will provide to EU policymakers knowledge about the characteristics and resources, but also the strengths and weaknesses, of national civil security systems and regional security architectures. Furthermore, in order to achieve the full desired impact for SEC-2011.6.1-1, we interpret the 'clear view' text above to suggest that we should take the additional step of *providing advice*[1], based on consensually agreed upon objective indicators and analysis, about what changes or modifications could result in improvements to the security situation in certain regions or countries where this might be desired by EU policymakers. 'Successful enhancement' might involve, among other things, achieving improved interoperability at the regional level, improving threat-specific responses either within countries or within regions, and identifying and implementing successful generic capacities that the supranational level should know about and learn from.

The project results will provide an enhanced understanding of what features of civil security systems work, what doesn't, and what changes and modifications *might* be instituted for particular types of risks, crises and disasters, and countries and regions. This will allow the EU to obtain a clear view of what needs to be done to improve the security of citizens; to restore security and safety in case of crisis; and to increase security systems integration, interconnectivity and interoperability, all of which are main mission areas of the Security Programme.

We achieve the desired impact of ensuring EU-added value to policy stakeholders by devoting a work package (WP5) exclusively to including the input and feedback of a broad and comprehensive group of EU policy stakeholders (some of which have already been recruited and are listed under *Policy Stakeholder End-User Advisors* in Section 2.1 above) in our civil security systems analysis process from start to finish. This is accentuated by our consortium group of partners that come to the project with an existing and extensive contact network in the area of security policy at the EU, national and regional levels.

B3.2 Plan for use and dissemination of the foreground

B3.2.1 Dissemination and exploitation of project results

The project's dissemination strategy will be focused on ensuring the project results are fed into policymaking processes at both national and European levels. At the national level, project partners will outline a local dissemination strategy including direct mailing of research results, face-to-face meetings with practitioners, op-ed pieces in magazines that are read by policy makers, and seminars targeted at, and including policy makers. To support these efforts, we will produce a multi-media application (video that can be uploaded on websites and phones – see below).

---

[1] Indeed, from p. 38 of the 2011 Security Work Programme, actions in Activity 10.6 'Security and Society' are 'to provide improved insight *and advice* (our italics) for security policy makers, security research programme makers and (mission oriented) security research performers (in some cases, acting as "Think Tanks"). They aim to obtain a broad and well-based understanding of the public administrative, cultural and societal frameworks in which security enhancing policy measures, including in particular security research, take place.'

At the EU level, similar strategies will be carried out in cooperation with two Brussels-based policy platforms. The first is the European Policy Centre (EPC), an independent think-tank well-known by most EU practitioners. Through Mark Rhinard of SIIA, who is also a Senior Advisor at the EPC, the project will publish its key findings in one of EPC's publication outlets (e.g. an issue paper or policy brief). The EPC's mailing lists reach more than 6000 EU practitioners. In addition, we will present our results in Brussels (in cooperation with the EPC). The second Brussels platform is the Trans-European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA), a network of 30 international affairs think-tanks of which several consortium partners are members. TEPSA's networks, email groups, and Brussels office will provide a further platform to ensure the project's findings are publicized in the EU practitioner community. The project's findings will be disseminated through the CIVPRO Civil Protection Network which is a pan European network of research institutes and corporations dealing with studies on civil protection and emergency management. Additionally, the policy stakeholder group in WP5 will serve as a supplementary avenue for disseminating ANVIL results and achieving the expected impact.

Dissemination and exploitation of the project results and advances will be facilitated through the following supporting activities:

- Comprehensive and aggressive web presence: The central website of the project will be designed and developed for supporting the needs of the consortium management and internal synergy. In parallel it should provide for the widest possible visibility of the project objectives and its results.

The project web presence will be designed and implemented during the first months of the project, with continuously added content, as the project will advance. The public website of the project will be a central site from which all the work done as part of the project can be found. The site will provide project overviews and highlights; up-to-date information on intermediate and final project results, including public reports; project events, including conferences and workshops; contact details, etc. The website will have persistent URLs and it will be cross-linked from/to other relevant EC and EC sponsored sites. Web pages regarding the ANVIL project will also be created within the official web sites of the participating organizations in order to increase the visibility of the project. Twitter and Facebook sites promoting ANVIL will also be created at the start of the project and maintained during the 24 month project period and beyond. A LinkedIn group will also be started to engage professional policy makers in Europe. We will attract members to this group by making postings in related LinkedIn groups such as: International Relations and Affairs Group; Public Policy Network – International; EU Foreign and Security Policy; European Corporate Security Association.

- Developing and distributing project brochures: Printed dissemination material of the project such as brochures leaflets will be produced for distribution at relevant events.

- Creating a brief movie in which the key results of ANVIL are presented. We will capture our findings in a 5-minute video that all partners can use to share with policymakers and respondents. The video will be uploaded on the project website.

- Creating and carrying out a 'Dissemination and Exploitation Plan': The Dissemination and Awareness Plan is a report that will describe the plans of the consortium for disseminating the knowledge gained during the work, and for exploiting the results of the project among the different target groups.

- Posting reports, publications and presentations to the website: The writing of all reports for public dissemination in the project will be considered a dissemination activity. Reports for public dissemination created within the project will be made available through the project website.

Partners have experience and interest in publishing in refereed academic journals and making presentations at academic conferences, and also creating web publications. A major commitment in

the project is guaranteeing URL persistence for the reports and presentations that will be produced by the ANVIL consortium for at least five years after the official end of the project.

Additionally, the consortium will deliver regularly to the EC upon request, preparation of high quality power point presentations, videos, brochures, factsheets, posters and illustrative graphic materials (pie charts, tables, flow charts), photos of the A2 poster quality (300 dpi resolution, min 40 cm x 20 cm), on the concept, intermediate results and final results of the project.

B3.2.2 Management of Intellectual Property

Intellectual Property issues will be regulated by a common consortium agreement to be proposed by Resman and to be agreed by all partners. This will be based on the DESCA (see www.desca-fp7.eu) modular consortium agreement that has been developed specifically for FP7. Both exploitation rights and confidentiality issues will be addressed by an agreement that will link to the general right on use and exploitation of foreground and background knowledge. Background knowledge will be identified at the start of the project and documented as annexes to the contract. The partner who generates knowledge owns that particular knowledge. If partners have generated the knowledge jointly, they shall have ownership jointly. Details will be dealt with on a case by case basis. Access rights will be granted in accordance with and subject to the EU contract and the Consortium Agreement.

B4. Ethical Issues

Proposed activities will be carried out in compliance with fundamental ethical principles. In the event that ethical issues, including privacy are raised, they will be addressed before the proposed activity is carried out. The potential impact of the resulting activities on Fundamental Rights, ethical principles and societal values will be addressed as necessary. Informed consent and data protection procedures will be respected; all partners in the consortium will comply with relevant EU Directives on data protection and will provide the EU with copies of the appropriate authorisations from data protection authorities. This will be included as a deliverable in the project prior to the start of any work involving data that need to be protected.

An independent ethics expert (Dr. May Thorseth, Professor of Applied Ethics at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, see Section 2.1 above) has been recruited to serve on the End User Advisory Board of the ANVIL project in order to give advice about possible ethical issues. We will include an ethics report as a deliverable in the project.

In addition, detailed information will be provided to the competent local/national ethical boards/bodies/administration regarding the privacy/confidentiality and the procedures that will be implemented for data collection, storage, access, and sharing policies especially when third countries are concerned; protection, retention and destruction and confirmation that they comply with national and international/EU legislation.

Interviews with healthy volunteers will occur only in countries with ANVIL beneficiaries. Copies of ethical approvals/opinion/notification by the competent legal local/national Ethics Boards/Bodies/administrations will be submitted to the European Commission prior to commencement of the research. Data collection in third (non-beneficiary) countries will not involve interviews with healthy volunteers and therefore will not require national level ethics reviews.

Information with regard to compliance with international/EU legal framework for non EU MS Croatia and Serbia will be provided.

ETHICS ISSUES TABLE

(Note: Research involving activities marked with an asterisk * in the left column in the table below will be referred automatically to Ethics Review)

	Research on Human Embryo/ Foetus	YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryos?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Foetal Tissues/ Cells?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?		
*	Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?		
*	Does the proposed research on Human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT	XX	

	Research on Humans	YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve children?		
*	Does the proposed research involve patients?		
*	Does the proposed research involve persons not able to give consent?		
*	Does the proposed research involve adult healthy volunteers?	XX	
	Does the proposed research involve Human genetic material?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human biological samples?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human data collection?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT		

	Privacy	YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	XX	
	Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT		

	Research on Animals[2]	YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve research on animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic farm animals?		
*	Are those animals non-human primates?		
	Are those animals cloned farm animals?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT	XX	

---

[2] The type of animals involved in the research that fall under the scope of the Commission's Ethical Scrutiny procedures are defined in the Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes Official Journal L 358 , 18/12/1986 p. 0001 - 0028

Research Involving ICP Countries[3]	YES	Page
Is the proposed research (or parts of it) going to take place in the one or more of the ICP countries?		
Is any material used in the research (e.g. personal data, animal and /or human tissues samples, genetic material, live animal, etc) a) collected in any of the ICP countries?		
b) Exported to any other country (including ICPC and EU Member States)?		
I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT	XX	

Dual Use	YES	Page
Research having direct military use		
Research having the potential for terrorist abuse		
I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROJECT	XX	

B5.   Security sensitivity Issues

Following the security scrutiny, a group has been set up with sufficient knowledge of security issues to assess the security sensitivity of all deliverables:

- **Paul van Musscher**, Vice-Chief of Haaglanden (The wider The Hague area). Before he assumed this position, he was District Chief in Gouwe Ijssel and Leiden-Voorschoten. He holds an Executive Master of Public Administration (School for Police Leadership). Paul van Musscher has extensive experience with the management of public disorder and crisis management.

- **Mr. Emilio Delfini**, Officer at the Military Advisor's Office within the Secretariat of the Italian Government. Leut. Emilio Delfini works since 2002 at the Italian Prime Minister Military Advisor's Office. Previously he worked at the Information Technology Systems Acquisition Office at Italian Air Force Logistic Command, after work experiences at NATO Head Quarter and Italian Foreign Ministry. He graduated at Italian Air Force Academy, than obtained a MSc in Diplomatic and International Studies at University of Trieste. He also had training experiences in relevant security and technology institutions in UK, France and Germany.

- **Johnny Engell-Hansen**, General Secretariat, EU Situation Centre, Council of the European Union. Johnny Engell-Hansen joined the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union in 1994 and is currently Head of Operations Unit in the EU Situation Centre. The Unit's areas of responsibility include; monitoring and assessing world-wide events on a 24/7 basis and alerting senior EU officials and EU Member States to politically significant events; Open Sources Intelligence capability; deployable teams to ensure strategic information in a crisis situation; provision of core infrastructures (human and material) to support EU decision-making in case the EU Emergency and Crisis Coordination Arrangements are triggered; and implementation of IT

---

[3] In accordance with Article 12(1) of the Rules for Participation in FP7, 'International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC) means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income (L), lower-middle-income (LM) or upper-middle-income (UM) country. The list of countries is given in annex 1 of the work programme. Countries associated to the Seventh EU Framework Programme do not qualify as ICP Countries and therefore do not appear in this list.

platforms to optimise information exchange between the EU Situation Centre and its customers/partners in EU institutions, EU Member States and other international organisations.

B6. Gender aspects

We will strive to promote gender equality during the lifetime of the project by promoting

- Family friendly working conditions in all instances
- Women's participation in Consortium research activities
- Positive actions for women researchers re-entering professional life

References

Aaron, H. (2006) *Building Trust: Overcoming Suspicion in International Conflict.* State University of New York Press.

Ansell, B. et al., (eds.) (2010) *Social Policy in Small European States.*

Bailes, A. J., & Cottey, A. (2006) Regional security cooperation in the early 21st century, in *SIPRI Yearbook 2006: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, 195-223. Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage

Boin, A., Ekengren, M. & Rhinard, M. (2009) "The Study of Crisis Management" in *The Routledge Companion of Security Studies*, edited by Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer . London: Routledge.

Boin, A. (2009) Meeting the Challenges of Transboundary Crises: Building Blocks for Institutional Design. *Contingencies and Crisis Management* 17(4): 203–205.

Cottey, A. (2000) "Europe's new subregionalism" *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 23, no. 2 (2000): 23-47.

Cottey, A. (2007) *Security in the new Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Cottey, A. (ed.) (2007) Subregional Cooperation in the New Europe. London: Macmillan

CRESCENDO (2010) Coordination action on Risks, Evolution of threats and Context assessment by an Enlarged Network for an R&D roadmap. Accessed online 25 October 2010: www.crescendo-project.org

ESRIF (2009) *European Security Research and Innovation Forum Final Report*. Accessed online 25 October 2010: www.esrif.eu

Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Gambetta, D. (ed.) (1988) *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Hardin, R. (2002) *Trust and Trustworthiness.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation

Hardin, R. (2006) *Trust.* Cambridge, UK; Malden, USA: Polity Press.

Hellenberg, Timo and Visuri, Pekka: Air Passenger Transport Safety in case of CBRN terrorism, Final publication for the EC DG Home Affairs, WSOY 2010.

Hellenberg, Timo: Information Technologies and Decision Support Systems in Civil Protection, Report for the Council of the Baltic Sea States, Eurobaltic Publications, Helsinki 2006.

Hellenberg, Timo: Regionalisation of the Rescue Services, Report for the Council of the Baltic Sea States, Eurobaltic Publications, Helsinki 2006.

Hellenberg, Timo; Pursiainen, Christer & Kivelä, Hanna-Mari: Finnish Defence Forces and Homeland Security (Puolustusvoimat ja sisäinen turvallisuus), Maanpuolustuksen Tieteellinen Neuvottelukunta (MATINE), 2004.

Hellenberg, Timo; Pursiainen, Christer & Kivelä, Hanna-Mari: Finnish Defence Forces and Civilian Crisis Management (Puolustusvoimat ja kansainvälinen siviilikriisinhallinta), Maanpuolustuksen Tieteellinen Neuvottelukunta (MATINE), 2004.

Kuipers, S. & Matzen, N. (2008) *'*Do Birds of a Feather Flock Together? Variation in Crisis Management Capacity Amongst EU Member States*', in Security in Transition: Towards a New Paradigm for the European Union*, edited by Boin, A.*,* Ekengren, M. *and* Rhinard, M. Report in *Acta series*, B 41*,* Swedish National Defence College, Stockholm.

Lagadec, P. (2009) A New Cosmology of Risks and Crises: Time for a Radical Shift in Paradigm and Practice, Review of Policy Research26(4): 475-488.

Putnam, R. D. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. NJ, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rhinard, M. (2009) European Cooperation on Future Crises: Toward a Public Good? *Review of Policy Research* 26(4): 439-455.

Roe, E. & Schulman, P. (2008) *High Reliability Management: Operating on the Edge*. Standford University Press.

Rosenthal, et al., (2001) *Managing Crises: Threats, Dilemmas, Opportunities*. Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd.

Rosenthal, U. (1990) 'Politics in Administration: Max Weber and the Quest for Democratic Order', in *Dynamics in Australian Public Management: Selected Essay, edited by* Alexander Kouzmin and Nicholas Scott. Melbourne: Macmillan.

Sundelius, B. (2005) Functional security for the EU, in *Disasters, Diseases, Disruptions; a new D-drive for the EU*, edited by A Missiroli. Paris, ISS, *Chaillot Papers* (83): 67-84.

Visuri Pekka: Finland in the Cold War. (Helsinki: Otava), 2006.

Visuri Pekka: Guidelines for the Finnish Security and Defence Policy, (Helsinki: Otava), 2003.

Visuri Pekka: Finland and Crises, (Helsinki: Gaudeamus), 2003.