

Minutes

6th Meeting of the Horizon 2020 Protection and Security Advisory Group (E03010)

June 28, 2017, Brussels

1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting

The draft agenda and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Nature of the meeting

The meeting was non-public.

3. Opening

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed in particular four new PASAG members, who presented themselves in the course of a Tour de Table.

Tasks for this meeting comprise discussion on the impact sections of the Horizon 2020 Secure Societies Work Programme 2018-2010 and reviewing the ad-hoc working groups and the state of the working group papers (following up with feedback and comments over the coming days and weeks is expected).

Referring to the minutes of the 5th PASAG meeting, the Chair reminds the working groups to take into account the comments and conclusions of the last meeting for the working group papers.

4. Announcements (European Commission)

Referring to the Focus Area, which goes beyond the Secure Societies Challenge, the European Commission reported about the envisaged meeting of the PASAG Chair with chairs and members of other Horizon 2020 Advisory Groups. So far, positive replies have been received from the Advisory Groups for Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), Societal Challenge 3 (Energy), Societal Challenge 6 (Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies), and Space. The meeting could be planned for October 2017.

5. List of points discussed

5.1. Horizon 2020 Secure Societies Work Programme 2018-2020: Discussion of PASAG members' comments on impact sections

Before discussing impacts in more detail, the group discussed about funding mechanisms and expected impacts in a more general context.

The Chair mentioned the Kaggle Network, a network of computer scientists offering a platform for data science competitions, and a recent Kaggle challenge launched by the US

Homeland Security to improve threat algorithms related to airport security and to detect concealed weapons. Kaggle competitions and data are public. Kaggle uses Google cloud, and applies a crowdsourcing approach. Launching a challenge and inviting companies and scientists appears to be an interesting mechanism and a good way to stimulate new technologies. It was mentioned that Kaggle HLS competition is for US residents only.

The Hackathon model, and in particular a 2016 Hackathon in Amsterdam, was mentioned as another mechanism to stimulate debate and achieve interesting results in a short time. Hackathons are events in which computer programmers and others involved in software development collaborate intensively on a specific software project.

Referring to the networks included in the 2018-2020 Work Programme discussion included the following points:

- The question was raised whether there could be a network active in generating new ideas, also towards the future Framework Programme, and somehow compared to the initiatives mentioned before.
- It was highlighted that EU projects, due also to the requirements for financial management, are very different from initiatives like Kaggle or Hackathon. This does not mean that competitions with prizes could not be launched in similar fashion under the auspices of the EU utilising currently available funding instruments.
- The systems and communities in the US and Europe are very different. One example is the area of standardisation.
- PCP (Pre-Commercial Procurement) initiatives are considered important.
- Referring to the issue of uptake of project results the idea of a supranational mechanism, supported by Member States, was discussed, to make better use of project outputs and results. The thinking should go beyond the building of a network towards making it sustainable. A properly managed and pro-active network would require an operating budget that would need to be funded, but could yield significant added value at a relatively low cost.
- There are areas with no strong tradition in research, where the added value of research may not so easily be recognised. The problem is the uptake of novel ideas, hence the innovation, not a lack of ideas.
- The culture in many public authorities is different. Approaches towards disruptive technologies from within are unlikely. This could be a disadvantage of creating regular networks.

The European Commission mentioned that networks under Horizon 2020 Secure Societies are well financed. They will be managed the DG HOME, not by the Research Executive Agency (REA). The PASAG comments regarding networks will be taken into account for the impact sections of the networks, in particular with a view of the innovation potential of networks per se.

As regards innovation and referring to "Horizon prizes" ("challenge prizes" under Horizon 2020), the European Commission explained that DG CNECT is currently preparing a prize. While the Work Programme for 2018-2019 is close to final, detailed drafting for the 2020 Work Programme is likely to begin towards the end of 2018. Hence, there is an option for PASAG to provide a general recommendation for one or more Horizon prizes to be included in the 2020 Secure Societies Work Programme.

As regards standardisation in the Work Programme, and while not questioning overall the European standardisation mechanisms, the point was raised that the current standard mechanisms may not be the best suited for the specific area of security. Also, the Work Programme addresses standards in different contexts. The European Commission will add some clarification concerning standardisation in the introduction section of the Work Programme.

The question was raised how the collective impact of several projects is being assessed. The European Commission mentioned a recent "post-project impact survey", conducted by REA for the FP7 projects in FTC (Fight against Crime and Terrorism). The European Commission will contact REA about the results.

The group discussed impact sections for several areas (DRS (Disaster Resilient Societies), INFRA (Infrastructure)) in more detail. Questions, for instance regarding the model emergency network and smart cities and related impacts were raised and discussed.

Taking into account the PASAG suggestions, the European Commission will add clarification in the given impact sections of the Work Programme.

The next steps for the 2018-2010 Work Programme are:

- Discussion of the current Work Programme drafts by the Horizon 2020 Secure Societies Programme Committee on 30 June 2017.
- The Work Programme drafts are currently in Interservice Consultation.
- DG HOME will comment on the current text based on the discussion with PASAG.
- Other versions will follow before the Commission Decision in fall 2017.
- The Programme Committee will vote on the Work Programme in summer 2017.
- PASAG will not receive a new version for discussion.

5.2. PASAG Working Groups (review of WGs, WG membership, nomination of WG Chairs)

The Chair stated that several groups are without chair, due to the rotation of PASAG members, and that the working group papers are at different levels of progress.

The Commission highlighted that the Working Groups are ad-hoc WGs, tasked to provide a paper on a specific topic. WG papers should include an abstract. Once endorsed by the PASAG as a PASAG report, these PASAG reports will be published in an edited format.

PASAG members, in particular the new members, were invited to volunteer for one or more of the ad-hoc Working Groups. In addition, PASAG nominated chairs for those groups with a chair missing. The revised composition of the ad-hoc Working Groups can be found in the Annex to these minutes.

5.3. Working Group Reports: Endorsement of available reports & Finalisation/next steps for pending reports

The Chair highlighted that, once a Working Groups has provided their working group paper, the Working Group will cease to exist.

5.3.1. WG1 (Leveraging R&D&I to develop capability and enhance security industry sub-sectors)

The report of WG1 is almost ready. The PASAG Chair, having volunteered to chair also WG1 into conclusion, asked for comments on the report in the next days, prior final release.

5.3.2. WG2 (Combining existing H2020 pre-procurement tools, resources from EU programmes beyond H2020 and from EU Agencies in the field of security)

The PASAG Chair reported (in the absence of the WG Chair): The WG report is on its way to being finalised. A point in discussion is whether academia should provide research results for free to SMEs. The PASAG agreed that free royalty is not likely to be generally accepted by academia, and a likely disincentive to programme participation; hence a solution may be a low royalty. As an example, in Belgium, common ownership by both partners is possible, however this will depend on the Members State.

5.3.3. WG3 (Strategically addressing international cooperation in security R&D&I)

The WG report is ready and considered approved and will be sent to the European Commission in the next days.

5.3.4. WG4 (Achieving synergies between security and information-related fundamental rights (IRFR) in a digital intensive environment)

The WG Chair reported: The report is work in progress. The main recommendations are already elaborated. The report will also address how to manage industrial espionage, and topics like fake new and social media. Currently missing is the part on the "win-win" situation as regards security versus privacy, which will offer an additional perspective, but appears difficult to implement. The question was raised whether synergies between privacy and security regarding societal behaviour are included.

It is suggested to maybe reduce the number of issues addressed for the sake of clarity. A draft should be circulated soon.

5.3.5. WG5 (Validating innovative security solutions through processes to take account of practitioners' requirements and citizens' expectations)

The PASAG Chair reported (in the absence of the WG Chair): The report is close to be finalised. All necessary material is there. The intention is to issue the report in July.

5.3.6. WG6 (Dual-use R&D&I - the Civilian Perspective)

The PASAG Chair, now also WG Chair reported: The report needs further development.

Discussion included:

- The possible upcoming Commission initiative for a defence programme and how to "secure" Security Research in the Framework Programme.
- The question of TRL levels in the context of dual use and related differences between security and defence.

- The significant mismatch between the planning cycles for security and defence that may however, change, considering that commercial technologies become more relevant for defence and change more rapidly.

Timeline for this report is end of the year.

5.3.7. WG7 (Scenario analysis to identify technological capacity and gaps)

There are no results yet from this WG and the PASAG agrees that it should be revitalised. The PASAG Chair will explore the situation with the current WG Chair.

Referring also to a recent meeting of the Community of Users, the question was raised whether it could be possible to have a mapping or compilation of all scenarios from security projects in the last years. The European Commission pointed out that several scenarios and related information are most likely classified and, depending on the classification level, may be accessible only by persons with a Personal Security Clearance (and an established need-to-know).

The Commission will explore how to best respond to the request.

5.3. AOB

Referring to the Focus Area and the envisaged meeting with chairs and members from other Horizon 2020 Advisory Groups, the Chair suggested that 2-3 PASAG members should accompany him, ideally with some relation to the areas of Energy, ICT, Innovative and Reflective Societies, and Space. Five PASAG members volunteered.

5.4. Conclusions

Referring to the PASAG Working Group papers, the Chair confirmed the planning as follows: In addition to the WG3 report, the reports from WG1 and WG5 should be issued by the end of July 2017.

The timeline for the remaining WG papers is end of the year; polished drafts should be available by October 2017.

6. Next meeting

Next PASAG meeting proposed for Thursday, 30 November 2017.

7. List of participants

A. de Benedictis (Chair), L. Biescas, G. Civico, P. Espagnol, J-L. Gala, F. Heijmann, F. Martinelli, M. Missoweit, R. Riesco Granadino, E. Santiago, A. Spronska.