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3. Abstrac
t
The document contains a complete summary of the 62 interviews carried out between October 2014 and March 2015 of the SecurePART project. The data in this document is divided into 5 sections for each interview: implication and knowledge, CSO identity, opinion about CSO involvement and other additional aspects. In the Annex an individual quantitative data sheet corresponding to each of the interviews held is also found.

The activity reflected in this report corresponds to the Task 1.6 (Interviews with CSOs, other stakeholders and experts).

The interviews held have been used for selecting some of the case studies in task 1.7 (Case studies), analysed quantitatively in task 1.8 (Concatenation and statistical analysis) and analysed qualitatively in tasks 1.9 and 1.10 (SWOT Analysis and Conclusions Reporting).

4. Conduction of the interviews

The DoW included in the description of task 1.5 (Interviews with CSOs, other stakeholders and experts) a interview preparation procedure based on 8 steps that has been followed by the interviewers team in all the cases. Also the Dow proposed a 4-fold phases approach during the holding of the interview that is detailed in the Interview Guide (D1.9) with script and questionnaires to be used that also includes an informed consent procedure.

The interviewer team was composed of the following names and project partners:

- The team of Bantec: Elizabeth Isaacs, Luis Botifoll and Maria Quintans;
- The team of ENNA: Denisa Ionescu;
- The team of Nexus: Frank Balzer;
- The team of Goethe University: Georgios Kolliarakis and Alexandra Ochs;
- The team of University of Salford: Caroline Davey.

5. Templates used

The reporting done reflects the two models of questionnaires presented in D1.9 (Interview Guide) that are based on the relationship established by the interviewee with the CSO: direct link (elected representative, manager or volunteer) or indirect link (external parties and independent experts). Accordingly, two different templates have been prepared to collect the information transmitted in
each of the interviews. It is to be noted that, in some exceptional cases, the reporting template
does not correspond to the link with the CSO; this is due to the moment of the interview when the
‘civil society’ profile of the organization related to the interviewee was not determinated.

6. Data protection procedure

Before each interview, interviewees were informed about their data protection rights via email
and before asking their eventual questions. After the interview, an email was sent to all of them so
they had access at any time to the information about their rights. A copy of this email was
forwarded to the person responsible in Bantec for saving this information.

This email is presented below:

According to Spanish Data Protection law, SecurePART would like to inform you that:

1. Your participation is voluntary.
2. All the questions raised during the interview are optional.
3. There is a file for processing all the personal data that will be used only for discovering facts and
   opinions that helps the EC to enhance the influence of civil society in formulating, implementing
   and monitoring EU security research.
4. The data will be collected, protected during the project and either destroyed or reused at the end
   of the research, if there are plans to reuse the data.
5. You can withdraw your data from the project at any time.

Bantec Group, coordinator of the SecurePART project that is based in the city of San Sebastian
(Spain) is the responsible for the file. Elizabeth Isaacs, Bantec, Spain is the contact person
(ei@bantec.es).

All 62 interviews have been anonymised following the data protection procedure established by
the Project Consortium. During the preparatory activity of the interviews, the names have not
internally circulated within the project team. Only the interviewer, strictly for those interviews
directly held by him/her and the project coordinator were in possession of the list of names. The
list of potential interviewees and contacts that finally have not been interviewed has been
removed. Drafts, hand notes and/or recording remained exclusively in possession of the
interviewer and have not been transmitted to the coordinator or other parties.

During the reporting activity, name of the interviewees have been carefully removed or
anonymized and gender identifiers (he, she, etc.) have been neutralised. In some exceptional
cases, the name of the CSO involved has also been anonymized when the interviewee requested to do so.

In the future, the project coordinator will keep the centralized list of all interviewees. This list will be at the disposal of the European Commission and the REA and transferred for verification, if requested, following the instructions of the data protection law.
7. Summary of the interviews

Interviewee number 1.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert. The interviewee is a managing partner of a niche research and consultancy firm focused on research and the provision of strategic, policy and regulatory advice on new technologies, privacy, trust, risk and security issues. The link comes from their involvement in many EU-funded projects related to security.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The respondent thinks that the involvement of CSOs in European security research is useful, as it is important to involve different type of partners, stakeholders from different countries as they can contribute with different points of view. The interviewee believes that the involvement of SMEs and CSOs in the European research projects is a positive thing, especially in security.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The interviewee has mentioned the experience with two CSOs in different projects:
- Privacy International in the Privacy Impact Assessments Framework project (PIAF);
- HELSINKI FOUNDATION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS in the Stakeholders Acting Together On the ethical impact assessment of Research and Innovation project (SATORI).

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The interviewee informs that Privacy International during the development of the PIAF project has contributed to identify what factors and contextual conditions might affect a decision to introduce a progressive privacy impact assessment (PIA) policy in each of the Member States through the realization of a survey.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The interviewee informs that Privacy International during the development of the PIAF project has obtained effective results as they did a survey to all national EU Data Protection Authorities (DPAs) as well as to a number of key stakeholders and non-EU DPAs. This survey was based on the 20 most urgent aspects from the point of view of the policy-maker, grouped into a few categories that could reflect the best possible PIA policy and practice.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The interviewee thinks that Privacy International with their participation in this Project has contributed to give Europe and European countries the opportunity to consider an in-depth
examination of Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) practices in other countries, to draw upon the best elements of those practices and to craft an even more effective Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) policy to address the vexing problems and challenges to the Information Society.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee thinks in two CSOs:

• Privacy International; and,
• Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights can contribute with interesting opinions and experiences.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 2.

0. Introduction

The European Academy of Technology and Innovation Assessment GmbH (EA) is a policy research institute that informs policymakers and business managers when facing the economic, social and political challenges presented by developments in science, technology and innovation. Their participation in this interview is considered interesting as they have participated in several FP7 projects like GREAT, ProGReSS, KNOWeSCAPE, PEERE, etc.

The respondent is considered sufficiently familiar with the activities of CSOs in the development of different research projects. She has been coordinator of different research projects and has participated as scientific staff in one European project “PRoMoting Global REsponsible research and Social and Scientific innovation (PRoGReSS)”.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The think-tank provides cutting-edge research for the needs of our economies to create innovation systems with optimally structured university-industry government networks. EA European Academy of Technology and Innovation Assessment GmbH combines interdisciplinary empirical research on issues identified as important for technology assessment and innovation performance with computational methods and to do this research they have participated in joint interdisciplinary research projects, mostly on European level:

- ProGReSS: Promoting Global Responsible Research & Social and Scientific Innovation (FP7 Coordination and Support Action);
- GREAT: Governance of Responsible Innovation (FP7 Collaborative project – STREP);
- KNOWeSCAPE: Analyzing the dynamics of information and knowledge landscapes (FP7 COST Action TD1210);
- PEERE: New frontiers of peer review (FP7 COST Action TD1306);
- INOGOV: Innovations in Climate Governance: Sources, Patterns and Effects (FP7 ISCH COST Action IS1309);
- eGovPoliNet – The Policy Community: Building a global, multidisciplinary digital governance and policy modeling research and practice community (FP7 Coordination and Support Action).

The respondent has participated as researcher in a project (PRoGReSS) granted by the European commission, but also has coordinated numerous research projects at national level such as: “Synthetic Biology”, “Clinical Research in Vulnerable Populations, “Pharming. Genetically modified plants and animals as future production site of pharmaceuticals?”

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The respondent has explained that as biology researcher she is interested in security research fields, and particularly interested in ethical issues, biosafety and biosecurity risks.

The interviewee has explained their main goals by participating in European research projects:

- Discusses Responsible Research and Innovation issues with stakeholders (academia, industry, policy advisors, etc.) from all over the world;
- Move the Responsible Research and Innovation debates form national or regional level to the global level;
- Investigate the characteristics of responsible practices;
- Development of new technological tools.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

They have been involved in several research projects of Framework Programme 7 out of security research theme, mainly in:

- Framework Programme 7: Science in society and ICT.
- COST: Materials, Physics and Nanosciences (MPNS) and Individuals, Societies, Cultures and Health (ISCH).

The interviewee does not see her participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

For the interviewee there are different factors that can positively improve their involvement in European research projects, such as:

- Propose unplayed research themes or according to the interviewee’ opinion allow to propose the participants new research areas. And in this way, get to open new fields of researching.
- Allow to increase the research team of the CSOs to do by their own the research work of the project. So the CSOs can use the funding of the project to increase their research team and to do their own research.

Until now, one of their main interests in the participation in security research issues has been also to get a new funding source that allows the CSO to be more independent of their other main sources of funding, and this is a point that affects to their research and their team.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The respondent believes that the Framework Programme should differentiate and separate the security aspects to the ethical aspects in independent calls, as in this way it could be get better competition and better research solutions.

The interviewee considerers that their participation in this type of projects is proactive (by
organizing projects, by involving top CSO representatives, etc.) but the interviewee thinks that the separation of ethical and security calls is a critical aspect of the Framework Programme 7 to improve and it could increase their participation in research projects.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
There are several CSO that has collaborated with the EA European Academy of Technology and Innovation Assessment GmbH, specifically during the development of the ProGReSS Project:

- South African San Institute (SASI): serving the San communities of Southern Africa
- Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS): assist members of the community to make more ethically informed choices
- Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics: a think-tank on global issues in the field of international economic relations and development cooperation.

**Keywords**: priorities of security research; project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 3.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert that has high level of experience in the participation in security research field at European level. The interviewee has been involved in 6 Security research projects and in one Sustainable surface transport research project of the Framework Programme 7 as senior researcher.

Specifically the interviewee has participated in the following security research projects of the FP7:

- CORE: Consistently Optimised Resilient Secure Global Supply-Chains;
- CWIT: Countering WEEE illegal trade;
- SAFEPOST: Reuse and Development of Security Knowledge Assets for International Postal Supply Chains;
- CASSANDRA: Common assessment and analysis of risk in global supply chains;
- FOCUS: Foresight Security Scenarios: Mapping Research to a Comprehensive Approach to Exogenous EU Roles;
- LOGSEC: Development of a strategic roadmap towards a large scale demonstration project in European logistics and supply chain security.

The interviewee is also lecturer and consultant in the fields of supply chain security and global trade and founder of Cross-border Research Association (CBRA) as an independent research institute to focus exclusively on supply chain security and trade facilitation research, acting as the Executive Director and a Board Member for CBRA.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
According to the respondent opinion it would be very useful to have a clear idea of the type of institutions that are Civil Society Organizations, so it could be good to have an official definition of CSO from the European Commission; even it could be helpful to have a list of European CSOs. In this way the respondent believes it would be easier to distinguish possible entities as CSOs.

The interviewee thinks that involvement of CSOs in European security research is useful; as they in their role of entity close to the final user can know the user’s requirements and their security needs. The interviewee believes that the role of CSOs in the European research projects can also contribute as evaluators of outcomes and with an active role in dissemination.

In the opinion of the respondent, in the past the CSOs used to be reactive in their participation in the security research projects, but the respondent has noticed a change in their way of participation and since two years ago the interviewee thinks that the CSOs are more active in their participation as they have realized that participate in this type of projects can be very beneficial
for these entities and their members’ interests because:

- Get funding to hire new people skilled in security issues;
- Participating in research projects and being up to date on the issues addressed at European level;
- It is a source of new opportunities for collaboration and research.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?

The interviewee has mentioned the experience with CLECAT (European Liaison Committee of Common Market Forwarders) in two European projects founded by the Framework Programme 7 in the Security call, specifically:

- LOGSEC: Development of a strategic roadmap towards a large scale demonstration project in European logistics and supply chain security;
- CORE: Consistently Optimised Resilient Secure Global Supply-Chains;

CLECAT participates in various FP7 projects in different roles (e.g. in the advisory committee, external expert or a full partner). At the moment CLECAT is involved as a partner in the following projects:

- EMAR: e-Maritime Strategic Framework and Simulation based Validation (SST call)

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?

The prima objective of CLECAT is to strengthen and improve the representation of the transport-logistics sector and customs services industry in Europe. In this respect, for the interviewee their main activities during the development of the LOGSEC and CORE projects were:

- Try to influence, on behalf of the transport-logistics and customs services sectors, the current and future legislation and regulation of the European Union;
- Voices the interests of its members when regulation is reviewed;
- Increase their knowledge in security transport of the future;
- Detect future opportunities in the transport sector;
- Implicate in practical research development;
- Advise and inform their Members about the effects of the projects developments on their sector.

The interviewee does not see his/her participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?

The interviewee informs that according to his/her experience referring the participation of CSOs in Security research projects in Framework Programme 7 the effectiveness of CSOs in these projects
depends on the use of their project funding, so if they use their budget to hire experts in the project issue, and this way they contribute to the project development with people experienced that can focus on the project, their contribution is quite positive and their participation is proactive.

The interviewee informs that during the experience, he/she also collaborated with some CSOs involved in security research projects who had a more reactive participation and in some cases they did not hire new people for the project development and, in these cases, the CSOs do not dedicate enough time to the project development and do not focus on the specific security theme.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
According to the respondent’s opinion, to the extent that CSOs used their project funds for hiring skilled people for the project development, their activities in the project may have more impact on society.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The respondent does not suggest any CSO to be interviewed.

**Keywords:** intra-CSO capability; project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 4.

0. Introduction
The respondent, as European projects officer of European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS), is the main responsible of the European projects of security research and other thematic developed by the EFUS. The interest of interviewing this person comes from their high level of experience in research projects as she has been implicated in European projects in the FP7 in security and other calls, specifically she has involved in the security research project SURVEILLE: Surveillance: Ethical Issues, Legal Limitations, and Efficiency.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
EFUS network aims to strengthen crime reduction policies and to promote the role of local authorities in national and European policies. EFUS’ mission is to foster multilateral exchanges throughout Europe, but also with other continents, about locally-developed practices and experiences, through: conferences, training sessions, publications and European-financed development projects. So one the values and principles that form the foundations of EFUS’ and its members’ actions is to involve the CSO in research projects for inform municipalities. The respondent and EFUS are very interested in security specifically in citizen protection including the following fields of security: urban security, data protection, protection of liberties, etc. They notably call for the full participation of this CSO in security research projects and in this way they have participated as partners in the European security project SURVEILLE and in other European projects such as security managers.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The respondent is very satisfied with the results of its participation as security research is one of the aims of the association and it is analyzed within the decision-making body of the CSO at least twice a year. During the security research project SURVEILLE, EFUS has carried out activities related with their experience and aims, being in charge of the end user group and carrying out the main following activities: survey, organize meetings (user group) and dissemination meetings.

As disseminator EFUS undertook 4 raising awareness sessions to communicate the results of the research about surveillance, protecting rights and types of surveillance technology deployed in Europe.

Most of the target audience of their activities in the project was municipalities in charge of security, many of them were members of EFUS, so communication and closeness in the objectives sought facilitated the completion of these tasks.

To evaluate the raising awareness activities realized as disseminators, EFUS used evaluation tools
such as online questionnaire and evaluation questionnaire after meetings for the municipalities, and according to these tools the end users were also satisfied with the results of the meeting and their participation in them.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

EFUS has participated in other research project outside the security theme, such as SECUCITIES MANAGERS: ET-LEONARDO DA VINCI 1, as coordinator.

EFUS has participated in surveys and has been invited to meetings for dissemination in different research projects.

Their participation in research projects can be both proactively and reactively:

- Proactively: organizing meetings and involving political leaders of the final targets groups;
- Reactively: presenting papers, etc.

The interviewee thinks that the involvement of EFUS in European research projects depends mainly on the topic (it must be interesting for the CSO) and the partnership. The interviewee also affirms that during their experience in the participation in security or research issues they have not received any support from governmental agencies and/or technological platforms.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

Local authorities in EFUS’ network demands citizen participation in security policy-making as civil society must play a role at all stages of the policy-making process, from conception, to implementation, to evaluation.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

For the interviewee, the factors that can positively improve their willingness or ability to be involved will be:

- To have enough and skilled staff for the project development;
- Require the political acceptance from the Executive Committee;
- Interesting topics for municipalities in charge of security.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

The interviewee proposes that a right person to be interviewed is a Professor of Politics and Philosophy and Head of the Interdisciplinary Ethics Research Group in PAIS, as security expert and collaborator with different CSOs in research projects.

Keywords: involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 5.

0. Introduction
The respondent is a manager of the Science Shop board of Bonn. This CSO has cooperated in international projects on training and mentoring Science Shops (TRAMS), citizen participation in science and technology (CIPAST) or Public Engagement in Research and Researchers Engaging with Society (PERARES) and coordinated an educational European project for primary schools and kindergartens, and SOUFFLEARNING, a project for the transfer of innovation in training staff of SMEs.

The interviewee is a member of a CSO with high level of experience in research projects and involved in several European projects.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
According to the interviewee, Bonn Science Shop as a mediator between science and civil society edit scientific findings critically and offer them to the public. Likewise they also try to bring questions from the public to the attention of universities, so that they can tackle them with their tools.

Both the respondent individually and the Bonn Science Shop are interested in research projects, as they are mediators between civil society and researchers. The main themes of interest for the research projects are: Civil Society & Sustainability, Health & Consumer Protection and Job Market & Education.

Reference security research the organization is interested in environmental risks as part of their main aims of work and in privacy, personal data protection and cybersecurity, as the organization manage a lot of personal data.

Science Shop cooperates with local universities and other institutions, organizations, Science Shops or stakeholders in Bonn as well as in Germany or on an international level to enable multidisciplinary research, dissemination of results and education.

The Bonn Science Shop participated in or coordinated from the very beginning in 1999, EU-supported projects such as SCIPAS (Study & Conference on Improving Public Access to Science through Science Shops), CIPAST (Citizen Participation in Science and Technology), EFSUPSS (Exploring the ground – Fostering Scientific Understanding in Primary Schools), ComScience (a FP7 network project providing added value to EU research dissemination efforts at regional level), SOUFFLEARNING (a LEONARDO transfer of innovation project for SMEs), PERARES (Public Engagement in Research and Researchers Engaging with Society) or RiB (Region in Balance - a state funded project on regional land use management).
2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The respondent is very satisfied with the results of its participation in research projects as one of the aims of the CSO is to be a mediator between Civil Society and researchers, so thanks to the participation on these projects Bonn Science Shop has achieved the following objectives:

- Strengthening civil society role in the research world;
- Building networking;
- To be updated about news, comments and latest technologies;
- Bring research to practical issues necessary for civil society organizations;
- Dissemination of results and exchange of experience on national and international level.

Summarizing, increase communication between civil society and researchers, so that the real problems and needs are transferred to researchers’ world.

Their participation in research projects has been both proactively as project coordinators, partners, and reactively, attending invitation from other projects. During the research projects developed, Bonn Science Shop has carried out activities related with their experience and aims, as coordinator in some projects or as project partner in others, and in any case contributing with their tasks to the project development carrying out the main following activities: Influencer, evaluator and disseminator (presentations, posters, policy briefing, work cafes, science conference, survey...).

The respondent explains that in the development of the research projects Science Shop Bonn as disseminator has undertook uncountable raising awareness sessions: website, conferences, presentations, twitter, newsletters, press releases, information brochures, etc. In these awareness sessions the main topics to get public engagement and to reach policy level were: project results, topics the CSO pick up from the newspapers, interesting topics for the audience, experiences, results and best practices from the partners, articles, etc.

The main target audience of their activities in the research projects is:

- Researchers;
- Civil Society Organizations;
- Policy makers;
- Individuals;
- Business and companies.

To evaluate the raising awareness activities realized as disseminators in the projects, the CSO use an assessment tool.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Science Shop Bonn has participated in research projects outside the security theme, including Framework Programme 7, Framework Programme 6 and Framework Programme 5.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
According to the interviewee, Science Shop Bonn wants to increase the communication from the civil society organizations and main public to the researchers, so civil society must play a role at all stages of the research projects, from conception, to implementation, to evaluation and dissemination.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
For the interviewee the factors that can positively improve their willingness or ability to be involved will be:
- To get financial support;
- To find productive topics to get CSO involvement;
- Public engagement.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee does not propose any other CSO representative.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 6.

0. Introduction
The respondent is related to the Global Risk Forum GRF Davos that promotes the worldwide exchange of know-how and expertise, creates solutions and fosters good practices in integrative risk management and climate change adaptation. One of its main aims is to target solutions and promote good practice in integral risk management and climate change adaptation for an improved understanding, assessment and management of disasters and risks that affect human safety, security, health, the environment, critical infrastructures, the economy and society at large.

The interviewee is an expert on risk management and has participated as project staff in the security research projects DITAC: Disaster Training curriculum and PEP: Public Empowerment Policies for Crisis Management.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Through a wide variety of activities including the involvement in European security projects it aims to bridge the gap between science, public administration, the private sector, professional practice and the public in the fields of risk reduction, disaster management, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. GRF Davos serves as a centre of excellence for the accumulation of knowledge, exchange of expertise and the proper use of tools and practical solutions for the application of timely and appropriate risk management strategies. It contributes to the reduction of vulnerability to all types of risks and disasters, and helps increase resilience in order to protect life, property, environment, critical infrastructures and business activities sustainably for the world-wide community.

The main themes of interest for the security research projects are: Environmental risks, Health risks, civil security, crisis management and civil protection.
GRF Davos has participated in two European supported projects:
- DITAC: Disaster Training curriculum;

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The respondent has different opinions about the results of its participation in research projects, the interviewee explains that while their experience in the PEP project was a success, their experience in the DITAC project was not so well.

Their main reasons for being involved in both projects were to:
- Increase research activities in these fields;
• Get funding for research project about interesting topics;
• Increase international researching;
• Bridge the gap between science and practice;
• Promote the worldwide exchange of know-how and experience.

Their participation in research projects has been both proactively as project partners and reactively, attending invitation from other projects. So apart from the DITAC and PEP projects, they have also collaborated in some other projects (such as ACRINME, ANDROID) as external advisors or being part of the Steering Committee.

During the security research project PEP, GRF Davos has carried out research activities realizing desk studies, organizing workshops and conferences.

During the development of the DITAC project, their main role was as disseminator. In this role they undertook 2 newsletters, 1 social media and 1 dissemination strategy. To evaluate the raising awareness activities realized as disseminators, GRF Davos used evaluation tools.

The main target audience of their activities in the research projects is:
• Public institutions;
• Researchers;
• Policy makers;
• Private institutions;
• ONGs.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
GRF Davos has participated in security research projects in the Framework Programme 7 as partners (PEP and DITAC) and also has collaborate externally with other security projects of the Framework Programme 7 (ACRINME and ANDROID).

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
According to the interviewee opinion, GRF Davos would like to be involved ideally:
• Carrying out CSOs core concerns;
• The involvement in the project would increase and reinforce the role of the CSO.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
For the interviewee, the factors that can positively improve their willingness or ability to be involved will be:
• Get funding for writing the proposal;
• Easy administrative process;
6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee proposes to contact the Croatian Urgent Medicine and Surgery Association (CROUMSA).

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 7.

0. Introduction
The respondent is a manager of Magen David Adom and disaster management and EU projects manager. The interviewee has been involved in numerous FP7 projects, specifically in the security area.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The respondent and the MDA are very interested in all the fields of security (health risks, environmental risks, peace, privacy, cybersecurity, individual civil rights, minority’s rights, religious and ethical issues, etc.) as the interviewee thinks that a security problem in health, as influenza epidemic can affect the 25% of the population, so this health risk is converted into a National Security issue. Although MDA is interested in all the issues about security, the main subsectors that interest the most to MDA are: infrastructure protection, physical protection and disasters and risks management.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The respondent is not satisfied with the results, as they do not reach the market, mainly because regulations only ask for demonstrating technological capability but not to reach the final product; and, especially in Security, the interviewee thinks that specific results are needed.

Another disadvantage is that the whole process is too long, so the final results can be useful for past threats but not for current threats. So, for the interviewee the whole process of about 5 years since the origin of the project idea to the final result is too much long, and even then the obtained result is not a product is only a technology that will need another year to get a final product.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
MDA has participated in various FP7 Security research projects, such as:

- NMFDISASTER: Identifying the needs of medical first responder in disasters (SEC-2007-7.0-02 European security research networks);
- ESS: Emergency Support System (SEC-2007-4.2-01 - Network enabled command and control system);
- CRISMA: Modelling crisis management for improved action and preparedness (SEC-2011.4.1-1 - Crisis management modelling tool - Integration Project);
- S-HELP: Securing Health. Emergency. Learning. Planning (SEC-2013.4.1-4 - Development of decision support tools for improving preparedness and response of Health Services involved in emergency situations – Capability Project);
• ETTIS: European security trend and threats (SEC-2011.6.3-1 - Assessing trends and threats in a society).

The main aim of the participation of MDA in security research projects is:
• Understand better the threat;
• Know possible solutions;
• Be informed of last and future technologies.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
For the interviewee the factors that can positively improve their involvement will be:
• Easy administrative data and management;
• Joint call of Security and Health, as the interviewee thinks that for example a pandemic is both a Security and Health issue;
• Continuous dialogue between stakeholders (SMEs, industry, CSOs, researchers, etc.);
• Shorter programmes in time;
• Demonstrative projects at product level.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The interviewee thinks that are 2 main points that could increase their involvement:
• Less and easier administrative data.
  o For the respondent the required administrative work to be involved in a FP7 is too high, as for example you need to do a report of hours employed per person at the level of WP and this is a type of task that an administrative system cannot support.
  o Also as it is not allow to include the VAT in the projects costs it is needed to do a double accountancy tasks, one with the normal one process that includes VAT and another system (that did not exist in the organization) that does not include VAT; so you need a new accountancy system in exclusive for the project.
• It is needed an educational process for CSOs in order to participate in these projects, and also it is needed to create and promote the dialogue between the different stakeholders: industrialists, researchers, academics and CSOs.

At this point, the respondent has pointed out the issue of forcing the inclusion of specific types of actors in the Security research projects, such as end users.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
In the NMFDISASTER project there was a CSO partner Fundación Rioja Salud that could be interested in being interviewed.

Keywords: priorities of security research; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 8.

0. Introduction
The Association Francaise de Normalisation (AFNOR) is member of European Committee for Standardization and the French national body for developing Standards.

The interviewee is a manager in AFNOR. This organization, that was considered as a CSO at the moment of the interview, has participated in the security research projects CRESCENDO (Collaborative and Robust Engineering using Simulation Capability Enabling Next Design Optimisation) and ORIGIN.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Security research and research issues in general are been analyzed and carefully study within the decision-making body of the CSO.

The respondent affirms that regarding the mission and vision of AFNOR, security research is a field interesting for them. Their interest related to security is quite wide, as all security areas and subsectors can be interesting: aviation, maritime, borders, infrastructure protection, counter terror intelligence, crisis management /civil protection, physical protection, protective clothing,… as any of them can need to be normalized.

AFNOR has participated in two European supported projects about security:
- CRESCENDO: Collaborative and Robust Engineering using Simulation Capability Enabling Next Design Optimisation;
- ORIGIN, a new approved project under Horizon 2020.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The respondent affirms that AFNOR is satisfied with their participation in security projects, specifically in the CRESCENDO project, as they have helped the Commission to set the standards on security and also has supported the research team of the project.

During the security research project PEP, GRF Davos has carried out research activities realizing desk studies, organizing workshops and conferences.

During the development of the CRESCENDO project, their main role was as disseminator. In this role, they organized a workshop. The main target audience of the workshop was:
- Public institutions;
- Researchers;
• Industry;
• Government;
• Standardization organizations.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

AFNOR has been involved as partner or coordinator in research project at European level outside the security research theme:

• Antiseptics and disinfectants - evaluation of standardized procedures aimed at activity testing
  o Founded under: FP4-SMT;
  o Funding scheme: CSC - Cost-sharing contracts;
  o Role: coordinator.

• Micro-Request-Based Aggregation, Forecasting and Scheduling of Energy Demand, Supply and Distribution
  o Founded under: FP7-ICT;
  o Call for proposal: FP7-ICT-ENERGY-2009-1;
  o Role: partner.

AFNOR has also collaborated in other research projects, such as A TOOL FOR DISSEMINATING PRODUCT ASSURANCE TECHNIQUES IN THE MECHANICAL INDUSTRIES (FP2-BRITE/EURAM 1), where a functional analysis (FA) tool based on the Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR) methodology (standard documents X50-150 to X50-153) was developed.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

According to the interviewee’s opinion, AFNORs would like to be involved ideally as influencer helping the researchers, partners and the Commission to set the standards on security or other issues.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

For the interviewee the factors that can positively improve their willingness to be involved will be to receive a bottom-up demand or a public requirement.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

The interviewee proposes the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique (FP7 participant)

Keywords: involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 9.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert. The interviewee is a professor of Critical Research in Technology and Director of the Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility, which is one of the research groups of the School of Computer Science and Informatics of the Faculty of Technology at De Montfort University. The interviewee has high level of experience in research and in collaborating with CSOs in research projects.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The respondent thinks that the intervention of CSOs in research projects is needed as they do interesting activities such as: dissemination, agenda settings, evaluator of proposals, etc.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The interviewee has mentioned the experience with two CSOs in different projects:

   1. BIG BROTHER WATCH: the professor interview them as external stakeholders in the development of the project Framework for Responsible Research and Innovation,
   2. ICT FOR PEACE FOUNDATION: the professor advice them for a research UK project.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The interviewee informs that ICT4Peace Foundation have been active in cybersecurity field since several years with advising governments and international organisations, by:
   - organising conferences;
   - participating in intergovernmental dialogues; and,
   - publishing cutting edge and forward looking reports on cybersecurity affairs.

They also explores and champions the use of ICTs for crisis management, humanitarian aid and peace-building. So according to the interviewee’s opinion, they can offers insights, strategic guidance and conduct after-action reviews of ICTs designed and deployed for such purposes.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The interviewee believes that both academic research and CSOs should collaborate in research projects, developing an integrated approach to research that complements and situates actual experiences within ongoing and reflective practice.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The interviewee thinks that by conducting research activities in conjunction with the universe of responding organizations, from funders to international organizations on the ground, to the
technology companies whose tools we depend upon, it would be possible to develop a multi-dimensional understanding of the challenge we face, explore potential responses, evaluate their effectiveness and devise means to implement them appropriately.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?

The interviewee thinks that both CSOs: Big Brother Watch and ICT for Peace Foundation can contribute with interesting opinions and experiences.

**Keywords:** trans-CSO networking; project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 10.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert. The interviewee is a manager of Fundación para el Conocimiento (MADRIDMASD). This organisation aims to contribute to the quality of higher education, science, technology and innovation as a key to competitiveness and welfare of citizens’ element. The Foundation is led by the regional government in spite of having a Foundation-based legal status.

The respondent as European project manager and Marie Skłodowska-Curie National Contact Point has a high level of experience in research and in certain projects has also participated in security research, such as the OSMOSIS which main objective was to support different organizations in being involved in the overall European security market.

At the moment of the interview, it was unclear if this organization could be considered as a CSO. For this reason, the questionnaire used was a mix of both models. After the meeting, the SecurePART Consortium has considered that the links with the Administration were sufficiently strong and MADRIDMASD has not been listed as CSO.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The respondent talked about the role played by the organization. MADRIDMASD has been involved continuously in research projects of the Framework Programme 7 outside the security research theme, as partners or also as collaborator or other roles such as observer.

For the respondent the main reasons for being involved in research projects are to:
- Get funding for hiring people to be involve in the project;
- Networking.

Their participation in research projects has been both proactively as project partners and reactively, attending invitation from other projects.

During the research projects MADRIDMASD has carried out dissemination, communication, training and information tasks. In the development of each research project MADRIDMASD as disseminator can undertake 20-30 awareness sessions: newsletters, blogs, news, interviews, web page, etc.

The main target audience of their activities in the research projects is:
- Academic sector;
- Technological centers;
 Companies (especially SMEs).

MADRIDMASD to evaluate the raising activities carried out use Google analytics, evaluation tool of its web, etc.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?

Through a wide variety of activities including the involvement in European security projects, MADRIDMASD aims joint the industry and the researchers. MADRIDMASD can be interested in security research projects or in any other research field, as they are interesting in horizontal actions because in Madrid there are researchers and companies from all types of sectors.

In relation to security, the respondent affirms that they can be interested in any subsector related to security: aviation, maritime, borders, infrastructure protection, counter terror intelligence, crisis management/civil protection, physical protection, protective clothing, etc.

MADRIDMASD has participated in one European security research project:

- OSMOSIS: The focus of the OSMOSIS project will be to support different organizations (mainly SMEs), in being involved in the overall European security market, by increasing their capabilities to understand and focus on security market trend and untapped potentials, link with relevant stakeholders, and facilitate their involvement in the technological supply chain, also by favoring joint research and development activities with RTD organizations and large industries.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?

The respondent is in general satisfied with the results of their participation in European research projects, and regarding OSMOSIS project the interviewee thinks it was too short in time. According to a personal opinion also projects in general should be longer in time.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?

For the interviewee, factors that are key to achieve significant results and need to be improved are:

- Have more personnel involve in the projects;
- Get pre-financing for the development of the projects;
- Increase the contacts with other stakeholders of research projects;
- Increase the duration of the projects.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?

Impact in society can only be achieved by the short number of organizations involved. According to the interviewee opinion, security is a ‘monopolized’ sector (in any of its subsectors). In the European research projects, coordinators are usually the same, so the interviewee thinks it is
complicated for the CSOs to enter in these projects as they are out of this monopoly.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed? The interviewee proposes to interview Consorzio Interuniversitario Nazionale per l’Informatica.

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 11.

0. Introduction

The German Security European Association (GESA) aims to contribute to a contemporary and progressive understanding of civil security in an overall societal context, exceeding national borders.

The respondent as project manager has high level of experience in security research at national level and is also the main responsible in the association of the development of the security research project ARCHIMEDES.

Exceptionally, two interviews were held with the same person (#11 and #34). They have not been integrated in the same template. Interviewers were different and emphasis is paid in different aspects.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The respondent affirms that one of the main tasks of its organization is security research in any of its subsectors: aviation, maritime, borders, infrastructure protection, counter terror intelligence, crisis management/civil protection, physical protection, protective clothing, etc.

In the interviewee’s opinion, the main market challenge in security sector is that the end users benefit from security sector and research, but the main customer of technology is the public not the company, so the challenge is to consider the public needs and requirements.

GESAs has participated in one European security research project:

- ARCHIMEDES: proposes to redefine innovation in Europe, from the definition of common operational needs to the validation of research results and deployment.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The respondent is in part satisfied with the results of their participation in European research projects, but in his opinion the ARCHIMEDES project was much more academic than GESA would wish. It has been a very ambitious project, so it was needed to reduce the requirements set during the project. In the interviewee opinion the academics do not get clear results as they do not consider sufficiently the end users requirements.

For the respondent the main reasons for being involved in ARCHIMEDES were to:

- The aim of the project coincided with GESA’s perspective, so to have a platform about innovation in the security topics helps to be competitive, to support the dialogue and understanding of the market at European level;
• GESA has already developed a platform similar to ARCHIMEDES at national level, with the project they had the opportunity to reach the European level and to get contact with European stakeholders in the sector;
• Get funding for security research.
• Networking.

Their participation in research projects has been both proactively as project partners and reactively, attending invitation from other projects.

During the research project ARCHIMEDES GESA has analyzed the innovation requirements of the end users, and tried to incorporate these requirements to the innovation process.

The main target audience of their activities in the research projects is:
• Large public;
• People in forums;
• Community security;
• End users.

GESA has not received or asked for any support from governmental agencies or technological platforms managing security research issues, as it is part of their own work.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
GESA has participated at European level only in the ARCHIMEDES project, but now they want to increase their participation in security research at European level and they do not discard any role in their future participation and involvement.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
According to the interviewee opinion, security sector should consider more the end user requirements and this should be applied also to the security research projects, so the end user opinion should be consider from the moment of including a topic in a FP7 programme.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
For the interviewee the factors that can positively improve their willingness or ability to be involved will be:
• Reduce the number of partners needed for a consortium, as to bring together too many entities is complicated;
• FP7 funding structure was for many companies too restrictive;
• Too control by EU funding and this is too risky for industry;
• Reduce deliverables and administrative data.
6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee proposes to interviewee EOS as they were the project coordinators of ARCHIMEDES

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 12.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert. The interviewee has high level of experience in the participation in security research field at European level as a security NCP in Portugal. The interviewee is giving a personal opinion, as security expert but not as a national delegate.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
According to the respondent opinion most of the CSOs concern social nature so they should participate in Societal Challenge number 6, but not in Challenge number 7, because challenge 7 aims to research final solutions providing security solutions and this is not the main concern of CSOs.

So the interview thinks that CSOs could be involve in research projects under societal challenge nº 6, as it main concern is societal aspects of security.

In the respondent’s opinion, most of the CSOs have been more active as influencers in security research projects. The interviewee thinks that CSOs should be participate in the Challenge number 6 as partners in any possible role, but not much as influencers as the interviewee thinks CSOs should be involved only in the societal aspects of the security in the research projects.

He thinks that topics about societal aspects of security should be always include in challenge number 6 and in his opinion is a mistake mix in the same call complete different entities. The respondent thinks that for solving security needs in a security project the main entities to be involved are industry and researchers, but for this type of projects CSOs are not the best partner. Anyway in this type of projects the respondent thinks that the EU commission should allows to the consortium to decide if it is necessary to include a CSO as partner or as external adviser to address one particular societal aspect. The respondent thinks that it should be never compulsory including CSOs in a project.

The interviewee thinks that H2020 has many topics about societal impacts but not many topics about end user needs to be develop by entities that can assure security. Besides, H2020 has mixture two different problems:
- Societal topics;
- Security topics.

And in his opinion this is only beneficial for CSOs but is bad for security sector.

At this point the interviewee wants to differentiate societal CSOs to operational ones, as in his
opinion entities like police force who concerns societal aspects and must respect the ethics, have operational needs that should be included in security research projects to give end user requirements.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The interviewee as NCP of security knows various CSOs involved in security research under FP7, but the interviewee prefers to give in this interview a personal opinion about the general participation of CSOs in security research projects.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
According to respondent opinion the activities of the CSOs will be more relevant if they are involved in challenge 6 (social sciences and humanities), but no in challenge 7 (secure societies). CSOs should collaborate in Challenge 6, but not in Challenge 7. In Challenge 7 the CSOs participation has very small interest and the view of end users is much interesting because end users are crucial for a good research and a good project.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
According to respondent opinion, the activities of the CSOs will achieve more effective results if they are involved in challenge 6, but no in challenge 7. In the interviewee’s opinion, H2020 has given big emphasis to societal aspects without security results.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
According to their opinion the activity of the CSOs will impact much more on society when the project addresses social problems or social needs. In the expert opinion CSOs should be more involves in topics about human rights, ethical issues, and those problem should not be discussed in security challenge 7, but in challenge number 6.

In their opinion security research projects is much more close to the CSO interest because the force of the CSOs lobbies. In their opinion it is wrong to include CSOs in challenge 7, as in this challenge the importance is in the participation of end users.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The respondent does not suggest any CSO to be interview.

Keywords: priorities of security research; project participation assessment.
**Interview number 13.**

**0. Introduction**
The interviewee is an independent expert and member of the Stakeholders Board in the SecurePART project. This interview was conceived as a pilot for future interviews.

The interviewee is security analyst and adviser. The interviewee is specialized in public and private aspects related to security and resilience. From January 2011, and has been pursuing an MPhil/PhD degree with the Department of War Studies at King’s College, London. From 2008-2012, the interviewee served as Policy Adviser (Security and Resilience) to ADS – the organization advancing the UK AeroSpace, Defence and Security Industries. In this role the interviewee provided security policy advice to the ADS Security Sector Board and acted as secretary to two working groups of the UK Security and Resilience Industry Suppliers’ Community (RISC); the RISC International Group and the RISC Policy Committee. Previously, the interviewee served as a member of the Home Office’s Olympic and Paralympic Industry Advisory Group (IAG) and was Security Executive to both the winning London 2012 Olympic bid team and the London 2012 Organising Committee (LOCOG). The interviewee has experience in project management roles at HM Treasury’s Office of Government Commerce (OGC), as an accreditation executive for the UK Conservative Party’s conference unit, at London 2012 and at ADS.

1. **What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?**
The interviewee thinks that CSOs want to have a stronger representation but it is important that their representatives have the abilities to influence not specifically in security research but in the private sector.

2. **Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?**
The interviewee has been working with ADS (premier trade organization advancing the UK Aerospace, Defense, and Security and Space industries). The industries represented by ADS are vital to the UK economy and are major drivers of growth and prosperity. The sector activities within ADS are designed to respond to the priority needs indicated by Members.

Moreover, within ADS it is the SCEG (Security in Complex Environments Group) that is a Special Interest Group, which was formed in January 2011 to define, develop and facilitate robust, internationally recognised professional standards for the UK Private Security Sector operating abroad. SCEG’s partnership with the UK Government is vital and provides a unique construct whereby an industry body has a sustained dialogue with government departments with opportunities to contribute to the debate, shape policies and influence international fora.
This organization has worked in different projects within FP7 and also in security research but not in the security programme itself. The interviewee has two main projects that are FIRE who looks to facilitate information security companies to improve take-up of European Trustworthy ICT research, and also enable researchers to connect and exploit their technology solutions with the format and ISOTRACK that proposed an initiative to improve the security of shipping containers.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
Based on Cordis database, ADS focused his work in the domain of finance; they gave a summary of the user needs for Trustworthy ICT, expressed by users who have contributed to the project’s Industrial and Commercial Networks.

The partner of the project worked on the state of art and dissemination activities. They were completely involved in the research work but they also have an influence on the development of it and actively participated in the internal discussions.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
From the point of view of the interviewee they are satisfied with their role as they made a constructive work. The CSO has been involved in several projects in a European and national level and they always tried to work as external experts, research actors to give their opinion and help in the research as much as they can. No evaluation was carried out to allow them for measuring the effectiveness of the results.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
Their activity in the project has a repercussion on the development of the research but also they collaborated in the dissemination of the project results among their representatives, and organizing or taking part of the events.

But it is also important that the outputs of their work have impact in regulations and implementing standards. They facilitate the discussion and consultation. For example it may have impacted regulations in a European or national level.

Especially in UK the interviewee is aware about their impact in human rights, operational, security industry to strength the regulation. The CSO has participated in constructive discussions being involved in multi-stakeholders board with companies and CSOs.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee thinks that the CSO may be interested in participate and tell us about their experience with security research.

Keywords: priorities of security research; project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 14.

0. Introduction
The interviewee works in the sub department of ‘finance and resource mobilization’ of the International Red Cross and in the Danish Red Cross. The interviewee holds a Master of Arts in History and Languages and Master of African Studies. The interviewee has extensive field experience from Africa and South East Asia, mainly related to community-based health and organizational development.

The interviewee is part of the innovation department in Red Cross and has participated in a few projects in the FP7 security research as project partners.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has participated in several projects in security research of the FP7. Normally they had the role of end-user, part of the research of the project.

Topics that interest most to the NGO are related with disaster management, risk, disable persons, mainly. Also, subsectors that are of interest and where they are working are infrastructure protection, physical protection and disasters and risk management.

As they works for the International Red Cross an at the same time with Danish Red Cross, even if their interests are not the same in the projects they have a common mission and vision.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
International and Danish Red Cross have participated in several projects and a few security research projects. In general de interviewee feels that their experience is very good because they worked in projects were they participation was successful and the network they met, was also very valuable.

The respondent is satisfied with the results because they can use them once the project has finalized. For example, they are working in the development of an operational guidance system to support organizations in complex emergencies such as earthquakes, flooding, bombings... that can affect entire populations with long-term psychosocial consequences impact.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
They have been working in FP7 and in other research frameworks at national and European level like, Life Long Learning or ECO, that have direct relation with disaster management. Now they are working in a couple of proposals in H2020 but not in security research this time.
Danish Red Cross has participated in various FP7 Security research projects, such as OPSIC (Operationalising Psychosocial Support in Crisis) that aim to have an overview of existing guidelines for psychosocial support in crisis management, translate guidelines and best practice into operational guidance system and test, demonstrate and integrate operational guidance system into existing end-user protocols. Also they participated in NMFRDISASTER that aim to identify the needs of medical first responder in disasters.

The organization has been involved in those projects because they find that it is a chance and it is very useful to develop their ideas with funding. Also they think that the network they develop is an added value of those actions.

The interviewee doesn’t see their participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board because they have no time for such activities and do not have sufficient funding to make them interesting for them.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
They feel comfortable as actor of the research in all those projects they participated because they knew very well about the thematic they were working on.

The interviewee said that of course, research is not easy for civil society organizations as they are not working all the time in innovation but is a key area for the organization.

Regarding other roles as being involved in the advisory group of a project or observer of projects or policies, they said that they have limited time to be involved in this kind of activities. Also they think that there is not much fund to be able to expend time on this or be an active participant of European forums.

In order to make more accessible research projects for CSOs, they think that the Research Programmes should make the work programmes in an easy way to be understood. Also the administrative part normally makes the development of the project difficult and tricky.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The interviewee does not see any important issue to be ameliorated. His experience in FP7 project is very good. The partners had a very good relation among each other and right now they are using one of the products developed in a SR project in their daily work. But they think that there some challenges that will increase their participation that are described below.

The interviewee thinks that the entire framework of FP7 or H2020 is difficult to understand for a CSO because it has a commercial focus. Normally DRC works with the industry that has another
overview about projects. Their working culture is different to CSO. The interviewee said that there are organizations that live exclusively of EC projects.

It is difficult if you are a CSO to meet or enter in a good consortium. And this is a key fact to have successful proposals. Organizations that are active in this kind of projects have an important lobby activity that helps them to be involved in lots of proposals.

The administrative part and the registration in the participant portal is so complex and difficult to understand if you are a new user.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
It can be contacted the British and Austrian Red Cross that have also participated in security research projects.

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 15.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is responsible of the Innovation Department in Pole Pegase. The mission of the Pole is to support innovation actions, not only the management of projects. It starts from the generation of new ideas to the development of the R&D project of products and services. The Pole detects new markets, describes roadmaps around industrial sectors, key technologies and implements major programmes. Pole Pegase has worked in different EC programmes and also in security research ones where they met different organizations. One of them is a civil society organization: Czech Association of Fire Officers.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The respondent thinks that the involvement of CSOs in European security research is useful, as it is important to involve different type of partners, stakeholders from different countries as they can contribute with different points of view. The interviewee believes that their experience working with CSOs has been so valuable and positive for the project.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The interviewee has an experience in the Heli4rescue project. This project gives Civil Security operators the possibility to define requirements of large air transport systems used for transporting heavy loads to crisis sites. In particular, it examines their deployment in civil emergency scenarios. The project partners are working to provide those civilian driven results as an input to future aircraft development programmes. The Czech Association of Fire Officers (CAFO) is involved in this project. Their aim is to develop the appropriate requirements to shape air transport solutions to be suited to large emergencies as encountered in a European context.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The interviewee said that CAFO during the development of the Heli4rescue project has contributed, as an actor of the research, to the state of art of the project, tester of the new solutions and in the dissemination actions mainly. They will support the project in the development of roadmaps toward effective implementation of the analyzed solutions.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The interviewee informs that Czech Association of Fire Officers during the development of the Heli4rescue project has obtained effective results so far. But the project has still not finished. In any case the interviewee organization and the consortium of the project is so happy with their activity and inputs they give to the project.
Until now, they have been working identifying crisis logistics problems and possible air transport solutions. Their inputs are very valuable and key for the rest of work packages. The main topics where they will work for are: Priority Civil Security users needs, validated Civil Security user requirements, definition of functional specifications compliant with Civil Security user requirements, an airship, and a transport development, development of Models for the deployment of the analyzed new aircraft within Civil Security crisis and disaster management situations and the Feasibility, economic and operational assessment of the proposed deployment models.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The interviewee thinks that CAFO, with their participation in this project, has contributed to give a new perspective to the fire officers of the Czech Republic as they can be involved in research actions and develop their way to act in different emergency situations.

As researcher and user of the research of the project, CAFO wants to increase their engagement in security research and in general research projects. They find that those projects are very interesting for them and their associates. Also it is interesting for them to be able for meeting new people and organizations.

Now they are working in other proposals, one of them with Pole Pegase and to be able to give a good input to all the projects where they are working and the proposals where they are working, they are dedicating more efforts in their ‘innovation’ department.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee thinks that Czech Association of Fire Officers may be interested to be interviewed.

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 16.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is a manager of the Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights. The mission of this CSO is to promote the development of a culture based on the respect of freedom and human rights in Poland and abroad. Since 2007, they hold consultancy status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), mainly through two of its initiatives: the Strategic Litigation Program that includes more than 100 precedent cases, which are litigated in order to bring systemic change in the human rights’ protection in Poland; and the Observatory for Freedom of Media in Poland. The Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights also belongs to the Zagranica Group, an association of Polish non-governmental organizations cooperating to provide international development assistance and humanitarian aid, and to promote democratic institutions. The HFHR is also a member of the European Council on Refugees and Exiles, as well as of the Democracy and Human Rights Education in Europe Network. The Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights is also a member of the Human Rights Network, an international coalition consisting of non-governmental organizations.

The interviewee is also involved with FRALEX, the network of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has several experiences in research projects but none of them in the security research programme of FP7 but the CSO has other projects related with security.

One of the most relevant projects where the CSO participated is the SATORI one. Its aim was to improve respect of ethics principles and laws in research and innovation, and to make sure that they are adequately adapted to the evolution of technologies and societal concerns. The main role in the project was ethical assessment. In WP4, the partners outlined an ethical assessment framework and created a roadmap for a fully developed framework. Also they were involved in WP2 by reviewing existing projects and identifying stakeholders where they did interviews and defined good practices. The output was an Assessment and Recommendations.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The CSO is very satisfied because the project is in line with the objectives of the Foundation. That is very good for them because they can work on internal or external projects with funding. Also, for them is very fruitful to be in contact with other stakeholders.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The CSO has been invited in several proposals but the CSO board only decided to participate in those that are more interesting for them. Those projects are the ones that in line with the mission and vision of their organization. They have not yet been invited to specifically take part in a SR project but they are very interested in this area because one of their main fields of specialization are digital rights, data protection, civil rights, cybersecurity, privacy, etc. among others. The interviewee expresses their attitude in FP7 as passive. They have been involved in EC projects because they have been requested to be part of the consortia. They are more active at a national level because they do litigations and they are working now, for example for operational secret services.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
They normally see themselves as project partners and their main role is as an actor of the research or an advisor for social research to different organizations.

They do not have specific persons or resources to be committed in every aspect related to FP7. For example, the resources to be committed in the execution of a project depend directly in the availability that the person who is specialized on the topic, can dedicate to the project.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
For them it is very important to build the capacity internally among the workers. They need to develop abilities and knowledge in order to increase their engagement in research projects.

It is also very important the involvement of CSOs in research projects but it is not easy for CSOs to understand the topics, project and the management of it.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
There are other CSOs involved in the SATORI project that may have interest in collaborating.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 17.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is a stakeholder expert of the SecurePART project. This interview was conceived as a pilot for further interviews.

The interviewee is a CSO representative of the Bundesnetzwerk Bürgerschaftliches Engagement (BBE) in Germany. The BBE is a nationwide network linking organizations and associations from the third sector (non-profit organizations) and civil society, from business and work life and federal and community institutions. The cooperation within the network is based on mutual trust and partnership, relying primarily on dialogue, cooperation and practical stimuli for the promotion of commitment and civic involvement. This common goal is the strengthening of civil society and of civic involvement. The key objective is the improvement of the general legal, organizational and institutional conditions for civic involvement.

Exceptionally, two interviews were held with different representatives (#17 and #45) of the same organisation. They have not been integrated in the same template. Interviewers were different and emphasis is paid in different aspects.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Apart from their experience as expert in a stakeholders board, they do not have yet a experience being observer, influencer, programme evaluator, actor of research, user of research, commissioner of research or disseminator, but they tried in the past a few times for the security programme and other research areas as actors of the research. It was in 2009 but the interviewee does not remember the subject of the projects. They are very interested in participating.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
They are satisfied because they had the chance to participate in proposals, connect with other organizations but they want to work internally in a research project or even to be in the stakeholders’ board.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
In H2020 they are working in several proposals. They have the perception that is much easier now because in the topics of the security research work programme asks directly for the involvement of specific CSOs as project partners. It pays more attention to CSOs and it is a key aspect that make more visible for CSOs.
From their point of view, FP7 was not as friendly programme as Life Long Learning or other Cultural or Media Programme.

The interviewee does not see his participation as influencer, observer for the moment but they are interested in being part of an advisory board.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
For the first moment, the interviewee only see their involvement as project partners and their main role would be actor of the research or advisor for social research to different organizations. They have an innovation area in the organization that is looking for being involved in research projects. The interviewee said that they should discuss internally about other ways to be involved in security research. They really do not know how they can be introduced.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
It will increase the willingness of BBE in security research if they were topics directly connected with their field of experience. They already define themselves as proactive in Security Research project but they find difficult to find a topic where they can give added value as civil protection or risk technologies.

The interviewee says that research have to link with people. CSOs assemble certain positions to transfer expertise.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
Not especially as they are not in contact with other CSOs apart from ENNA involved in a Security Research project.

Keywords: involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 18.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert. The interviewee works for the Environmental Security Sub-Directorate in the Criminal Intelligence Office of Interpol. The interviewee has promoted the CWIT project (Countering WEEE Illegal Trade) funded by the Security Research Programme of the European Commission.

In today’s global economy there is a need for an international strategy to deal with this type of crime. As the only organization with a mandate to share and process criminal information globally, INTERPOL is uniquely qualified to lead these efforts.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
From the point of view of the interviewee it is very important to incorporate in a project team different profiles and stakeholders. They do not only ask for participation to academic institutions or research centers but CSOs, private companies, among other.

Especially, CSOs can give the project a very good input about the real situation of about a specific field. The play in ground so their inputs are very valuable if you want that a project has outputs with added value.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
In the CWIT project they involved as project partner a CSO (Cross-border Research Association) and also in the Advisory Board other CSOs. The project is collecting, studying, and identifying gaps in the current legislation in place at the International and European level such as the European Commission Directives on substances in products placed on the market in Europe and their treatment. Cross-border Research Association, through data collection is working specially in analyse criminal activity and crime types associated with illegal WEEE shipments, draw on other work being carried out targeting illegal e-waste exports on an international scale. Also they assess the typology of companies (and brokers) involved in the export market and identifying those with a criminal history and develop detailed understanding of the destinations and routes used to carry illegal shipments, to possibly enable contacts with regulators and enforcers in destination countries.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The interviewee thinks that for the CSOs, Security research is a field of particular of interest. Not specifically in environmental risks that is the focus of this project but in general security technologies.
The interviewee is aware about the this CSO that is interested in being involved in security research projects but in their particular experience, the CSO had a passive attitude as they were invited to be involved but their role in the preparation of the proposal and in the research itself is very active. They have been involved in other security research projects as project partners as in the Cassandras project. The interviewee does not have the information to know if the CSO is involved in networks, association or consortia.

They are interested in being involved in security research projects to increase their network, to progress in their internal research because they have a research center associated to their organization and because it helps the consecution of the mission and vision.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?

The CSO is an actor of the research, gathering information of the state of art and analyzing the data. The objectives of their work are: to study the involvement of organized crime groups in the global distribution of WEEE; to identify the specific criminal activities associated with illegal WEEE shipments; to provide an estimation of the volume of WEEE generated and illegally traded.

The other main activity of the CSO will be to train and educate the industry with the recommendation on how to manage waste. There is already produced a new paper that outlines how the CWIT project will use the ‘UNU-KEYS’ as a harmonized classification system to deal with the variety of existing e-waste classifications.

The interviewee is not aware about these particular CSOs to be interested in having another role in FP7.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?

The impact of their activity was in the progress of the research mainly. At the end of the project it will have impact in the industry when the consortium will prepare events and they will lead the training of the industry regarding how to manage waste.

There is a workshop that will be organized in the framework of the International Electronics Recycling Congress 2015. The outcomes of the Cross-Border Research Association will lead to clear recommendation for policy makers to fight illicit trade in WEEE.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?

There is the Cross-border Research Association that may want to be interviewed to tell us their experience and also two other CSO that participate in the Advisory Board.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
0. Introduction

The interviewee is a stakeholder expert of the SecurePART project. This interview was conceived as a pilot for further interviews.

The interviewee is a Legal Affairs Manager in G4S. The interviewee represents the company within the trade association for guarding companies APEG-BVBO, is a member of various professional legal organizations, a member of the redaction board of Private Veiligheid — Sécurité Privé and the author of articles and contributions on various legal and security-related topics.

The interviewee is part of The EGE. It is an independent, pluralist and multidisciplinary body advising the European Commission on ethics in science and new technologies in connection with Community legislation or policies. The EGE members serve in a personal capacity and are asked to offer independent advice to the Commission. They have been appointed on the basis of their expertise and a geographical distribution that reflects the diversity in the European Union.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?

The European Commission has done a lot to increase the involvement of CSOs in security research. The interviewee thinks that there are CSOs less representative than other in security research projects. The interviewee wants to introduce a question: How do the EC define which CSO is representative?

The interviewee sees the role of CSO more as advisor than project partners or actors of the research. The interviewee has a particular concern about the intellectual property and confidentiality of the industry research. This is why the interviewee thinks that CSOs do not have to access to the internal research but to an oversight of it.

For G4S, good corporate citizenship works around four milestones: a solid focus on prevention; a clear, transparent and flexible regulatory framework; which is practical and balanced; and allows for partnerships between the industry, the public authorities and the public at large. Taking up its role in the public security debate is for G4S part and parcel of ethical behavior.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?

The interviewee knows the particular experience of the CSO called Statewatch. They have participated in a few security research projects as in the Secile security research project. Statewatch is one of Europe’s leading non-governmental providers of information about the
development and implementation of EU Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) and security policy. Statewatch’s JHA information services are used by tens of thousands of journalists, civil society organisations, policy-makers, governments, national and European parliamentarians, lawyers, academics, students, researchers and private organisations and individuals across Europe and throughout the world.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
Statewatch focused his work in the issue of surveillance technologies. The interviewee focuses on enhancing public safety through the development of security technologies and fostering the growth of a globally competitive European ‘Homeland Security’ market. The partner of the project worked on the state of art analysis and dissemination activities. They were completely involved in the research work but they also have an influence on the development of it and actively participated in the internal discussions. The project believes that only a fully integrated view, taking a wide range of perspectives into account, can produce a comprehensive understanding of counter-terrorism’s impact, effectiveness and legitimacy. This is reflected in the composition of our consortium which includes academics, NGOs, judicial institutions, security services, and industry. Through the three stages of SECILE set out above they aim to produce research that is both useful to policy-makers and operational actors, and advances knowledge.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
Statewatch helped with the state of art and conducted a comprehensive study of the existing EU counter-terrorism measures. This study found that the EU has introduced over 200 counter-terrorism measures since September 2001, 88 of which were ‘hard law’. Statewatch then studied two further issues in particular: transposition into national law and review of these measures. In both cases they found that member states have often been slow to transpose these measures into their domestic law, sometimes only doing so when legal action was imminent. In order to illustrate these trends more concretely, Statewatch carried out a case study of the EU’s data retention directive.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
Their activity in the project has an impact on the development of the research but also they collaborated in the dissemination of the project results among their representatives, and organizing or taking part of the events and forums.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
A representative of the CSO Statewatch may be willing to collaborate with SecurePART in order to explain their experience in security research projects.

Keywords: priorities of security research; project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 20.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is Professor of Politics and Philosophy and member of an Ethics Research Group. Also, the interviewee is an active member of the Amnesty International and worked as practitioner in business and human rights.

The interviewee has been involved in different FP7 projects in security research, such as DETECTOR, SURVEILLE, INDECT, FOCUS, MOSES and FASTPASS. The interviewee has participated in a project on ethics and border guarding for FRONTEX.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The interviewee had a few experiences in Security Research projects with CSOs that were invited as experts or they were project partners. The interviewee thinks that in order to fulfill with the ethical aspects of the research, it is needed that CSOs are involved in some way in the projects. Also, it is needed to increase their overall role in projects.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The interviewee has a controversial experience with the INDECT project in the area of intelligent security systems. The purpose of the project was to involve European scientists and researchers in the development of solutions tools for automatic threat detection through, for example processing of CCTV camera data streams, standardization of video sequence quality for user applications, threat detection in computer network as well as data and privacy protection. The area of research, applied methods and techniques that are described in public deliverables which are available to the public on the project’s website. Practically, all information related to the research is public. Some media and other sources accuse INDECT of privacy abuse, collecting personal data, and keeping information from the public. Consequently, these issues have been commented and discussed by some Members of the European Parliament. The rumors about testing INDECT during 2012 UEFA Football Championship also turned out to be false. The mid-term review of the project strongly urges to immediately make all documents available and to define a clear and strict mandate for the research goal, the application, and the end users of INDECT, and stresses a thorough investigation of the possible impact on fundamental rights. Nevertheless, the project had the ethical review where different experts and CSOs that were representatives of the multimedia industry, ethics, human rights and philosophy.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The Ethics Board is responsible for managing and monitoring ethical aspects through the duration of the project, including the promotion of gender equality in the project. This Board analyses the
research work and proposes solutions to the Project Consortium to cope with all the ethical issues faced by the project. This Board also informs the European Commission annually.

This Board supports the project consortium in examining the societal, political and legal aspects of potential applications, especially dual use applications, defines and approves the future exploitation plans of the project results, and controls dissemination and communication strategy of research results to a wider audience. Any trial system could be implemented only in case when it would be fully validated. The Ethics Board analyses and proposes solutions to cope with all the ethical issues faced by the project. Problems and relevant solutions are discussed during Ethics Board meetings, via e-mails, teleconferences based on exchange of opinions with the researchers involved in the technical aspects of the project.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The INDECT project addresses a number of ethical issues because of its nature, where sensitive information, if implemented in policy work, can be processed in many different ways, from security video feeds to intelligent multimedia content analysis in information storage and processing. This was a special example of CSOs involvement in security research. The interviewee thinks that CSOs should increase their involvement as advisor or influencer of the research. It is very important that they give their opinion about current SR actions in order to assure a correct implementation of the EU funds.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The interviewee thinks that their participation in this project has contributed to give a new perspective to the project and assure that the citizens opinions is took into account and ethics has been assured in the development of the research.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
It is possible but the interviewee thinks that it will be better to interview CSO involved in the DETECTOR or SURVEILLE projects as they are good examples of how to engage them.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 21.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is part of the stakeholders’ board of the SecurePART project.

The interviewee is a collaborator in Pax Christi, a CSO that works together with involved civilians and partners in areas of war, to protect human security, to prevent end armed violence and to build peace with justice. Also, the interviewee coordinates a working group on Weapons of Mass Destruction.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Apart from their experience in the stakeholders board of this project they do not have yet a experience as actors of the research for example, but they participated in proposals in the past a few times not specifically for security research but for the green economy research programme.

The CSO has not been involved in European security research, but they would be interested in participating.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewee thinks that it is important to increase the involvement of CSO in research and indeed in security research. CSOs have a specific mission and vision and sometimes it is difficult for them to see how the topics of the work programmes can fit with it.

From their experience CSOs have a passive attitude for being involved in projects, so for some of them it is not easy to be in a project. In case that any partner suggest them to be involved and the aim of the project fits with their mission and vision they will surely participate.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
They have a passive attitude in security research projects. They find very interesting to be involved in a projects but they do not have sufficient expertise to lead a proposal. In any case, if they are asked for being involved in a project that is in line with the mission and vision of Pax Christi they will for sure work on it.

The interviewee does not see their participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board because they have no time or sufficient interest for such activities for the moment.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
They would like to be an actor of the research or an advisor about the protection of human
security.

The interviewee talks about having personnel available and with sufficient experience to be able to carry out the project. It is not easy to have this profile in the organization.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
It will increase the willingness of Pax Christi in security research if they were topics directly connected with their field of experience. They find difficult to find a topic where they can give added value as civil protection or risk technologies.

Also, the interviewee said that it is difficult to find key partners or to be found in a project, the interviewee suggest that it will be good to have support for partner search. Perhaps to be involved in key European Technology Platforms related with their area of expertise.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
Not especially as the interviewee is not usually in contact with other CSOs.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; inter-CSO networking; trans-CSO networking.
Interviewee number 22

0. Introduction
The respondent is a manager of Tecnalia, a major Research Center from the Basque Country (Spain).

The interviewee is specialized in telecom technologies, information management systems, innovation systems and high-risk project management. The interviewee has been involved i.e. in the Social Security Network and Innosec projects. The interviewee has worked with different civil society organizations in FP7 projects.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The interviewee has a few experiences in working with CSOs in different projects not only for security research but in the FP7 programme in general. The opinion of the interviewee is very positive. CSOs give a different and important point of view about the development of research but it is difficult for them to get into a project as the topics of the work programme are normally very theoretical. It is difficult for CSOs to see how they can help in the projects and how the results of the research will impact the society or their representatives.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The Austrian Red Cross was partner of the Innosec project. The interviewee is aware that ARC is active in FP7 and in security research in the field of ambulance service, health and social services, blood programmes, disaster relief, tracing services, education and training, humanitarian law, youth and first aid. As ARC is a very big institution (more than 5000 persons working) the Department for Operation, Innovation, and Subsidiaries has had extensive experience on disaster management. It supports the provincial Red Cross branches in developing their services in an adequate and future-oriented way and carries out a variety of projects and offers training on different levels. This department is active at EU and international level. One task of the department in daily work is to identify societal needs and to develop concepts and projects to address these accordingly. The concepts and projects are mainly developed and carried out in Austria, but through its strong connection to Red Cross Red Crescent partners and other stakeholders (EU and international), partnerships are formed and knowledge is transferred to other countries and contexts. The department has successfully developed and implemented a number of EU projects with innovative character in the field of disaster management and in meeting other identified needs, and which relates to the Red Cross mandate. Within the project InnoSec, ARC contributed as end-user of the project with manifold experience in disaster and crisis management.
3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
They participated as actors of the research. At the beginning of the project, they were interviewed in order to know the state of art of the research. Also, they had a key role for testing Innosec model. The aim of Innosec was to develop a modular model for innovation management that allows different end-users organizations to adapt the modules that could be more convenient in terms of their current innovation requirements and situation related to coordination with other stakeholders to deliver effective and efficient security services to the society. Now, ARC has implemented in the organization this model and the department working in Innosec project is already using it.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The interviewee express how difficult is to deal with the CSOs in general. According to the experience of the interviewee, it was very important to contact them and visit them into their office in order to understand how they work. After this first contact, other stakeholders (industry, researchers) can be able to define the tasks that the CSO could develop in the project. The interviewee found that it was very difficult for them to enter in the theory as their normal work is next to the people but not innovating. Once the project is understood how the CSOs work, the final testing was adapted in order to facilitate the CSOs work. That was not the experience with ARC as they have lot of experience in FP7 projects and they know how to work within a consortium.

The interviewee thinks that important ways to proceed with CSOs in research projects have to be developed. It is not the same to work with the industry or a research centre than with CSOs. They are not used to work with industrial partners.

Also it is important that industrial partners understand the way that CSOs work normally. So, a good communication among the partners must take place before and during the project.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The interviewee thinks that ARC, with their participation in this project, has contributed to give a new perspective to the project. Also they helped in the development of the innovative service and implemented correctly. The project was a success in this case.

6. Do you think the representatives of this particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The CSO representative proposed is a manager of the Austrian Red Cross.

**Keywords:** trans-CSO networking; priorities of security research.
Interviewee number 23.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is part of the Stakeholders Board of the SecurePART project.

The interviewee is the Executive Director of a Civil Society Organization that works on Haut Comité Français pour la Défense Civile - HCFDC. HCFDC is a non-profit association created by the civil society. It is an exchange platform between public institutions and private companies and critical infrastructure operators on global security issues. HCFDC is expert and is chairing debates on the following doctrinal and technical concepts: planning & prevention, critical infrastructure protection & resilience, emergency & crisis management, CBRN defense, organizing relief & care, assistance to populations, technology issues on security, business continuity and resilience. To promote these reflections, HCFDC is organizing many activities: technical symposium, seminars; yearly course on Homeland Security; training exercises on CBRN, Terrorism and Emergency, Crisis management; publications; study tours and site visits; participation in EU and French research programs. To lead its work, HCFDC is gathering more than 2000 members and 6000 affiliates from local to International public and private bodies.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
HCFDC has been involved in a few projects regarding Security Research of the FP7 programme as CBRNE map (www.cbrnecenter.eu/project/cbrnemap/) that wants to create a road-map for development of a CBRNE ((C)hemical, (B)iological, (R)adiological, (N)uclear and (E)xplosive substances ) demonstrator or Practice (www.practice-fp7-security.eu) that is working for improving the preparedness and resilience of EU member states and associated countries from an attack by a terrorist group using non-conventional weapons, specifically an attack with CBRN (Chemical, Biological, Radiological and/or Nuclear) materials.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
From HCFDC point of view, the aim of the project was fulfilled. The mission of HCFDC is to enhance the involvement of security End-Users & Operators in European research activities in HCDFC. In Archimedes they organized 10 roundtables, each one on a specific security topic. Also they create a Virtual Community for Security End-Users & Operators in order to link with these important stakeholders.

HCFDC was in charge of two main activities in the project:

- To organize round tables;
- Dissemination actions.

The Roundtables and the Community provided opportunities for end-users & operators to
network and contribute to the Archimedes discussions on Innovation Management Practices, to promote the end-user definition of operational needs and to increase their coordination at European level. At the Annex there is a short description about each roundtable.

Finally, Archimedes leveraged on its extensive networks at the European and national level to insert its findings and end-users' and operators' feedback into the policy-making process, amongst others for the EU's Horizon 2020 research agenda and beyond.

Having into account that the HCFDC works on the exchange of information with different security research stakeholders, one of their objectives was to establish a dialogue and cooperation between security research organizations coordinating the national security demand and supply side better supporting implementation of the activities foreseen by the European Security Industrial Policy.

Within this objective, they provided a structure support to such dialogue and cooperation with the creation of a European Network of National Organizations for Security called AEGIS (Alliance for European Growth and Innovation and Security), including end users, operators, among other.

The activities done were implemented effectively. The CSO has a lot of experience in this field and is the only partner with sufficient knowledge to carry out the roundtable and the TV show as they have the media to develop it.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

HCFDC has been invited to participate in a few projects but they did not lead any of them or actively promote them.

The organization has worked in various projects in security research framework and outside it, as for example Archimedes (www.archimedes-eu.eu) that aim to overcome the cultural, practical, economic, social and legal difficulties that prevent the exploitation of R&T results in Europe by enhancing end-users' & operators' ownership of all stages of the European research process, and hence by making European research more end-user & operator friendly.

The interviewee doesn’t see his participation in Europe as influencer, observer not even in advisory board.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The interview feels comfortable as project partner but also they has been working as external experts of other security research projects where they can give their opinion and point of view about the research. The interviewee does not see them acting in another way.
It is important to take into account that because of the work of the interviewee, in their daily life, the interviewee is in contact with a lot of different people, researchers, politicians, media, etc. In this way, they have their own network but their main interest is not much advocacy but cooperate with them in different initiatives.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The organization has been involved in several FP7 security projects. The interviewee thinks that it is important to engage more CSOs in those kinds of projects but the interviewee assumes that is difficult to enter. The interviewee says that FP7 is a professional network not adapted to organizations that work on a ground level. The interviewee suggested that the EC should change their vocabulary in order to adapt it to the specific area where the target organizations work. In other words, the interviewee says that it is difficult to engage more CSOs to EC projects because it is too complicated to understand what they are looking with the proposed topics.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

The interviewee opinion is that there are other CSOs willing to be involved but it is difficult for them to enter in the projects. The interviewee suggests organization working in AEGIS (Alliance for European Growth and Innovation and Security) would like to participate more actively in Security Research Projects.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 24.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is part of the Stakeholders Board of the SecurePART project.

The interviewee is Deputy Director of the Institute of Technology Assessment. The organization deals with the impacts of novel technologies on society, the environment, health, politics and the economy.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The respondent told that they had been working in different activities of FP7 projects that involved CSOs, indeed in security research projects.

The interviewee thinks that the involvement of CSOs in FP7 framework is very important as they are stakeholders of the security research and technologies. The interviewee thinks that industry, researchers, all the partners that are already working in SR should know what CSOs are thinking, their interests and their attitude about different developments arising.

The interviewee is aware about CSOs involved in projects that had relation with various thematic but mainly with human rights, privacy advocates, ethical, and minorities... among other.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The respondent refers to the experience in the PRISE project that aim to promote a secure future for European citizens based on innovative security technologies and policies in line with privacy protection and human rights.

The consortium organized two workshops, one per year of activity of the project where it was discussed different questions raised to the stakeholders invited. For the first one it was titled ‘privacy and security’. They prepared three workshops with the following questions raised:

- How can you balance privacy and inner security?
- Scenarios – asking the citizens;
- Criteria for privacy enhancing security technologies.

For the second one the title was ‘Guidelines and Criteria for Privacy Enhancing Security Technologies’. Also, it was prepared at the final stage of the project so, they had already mapped technologies, the legal situation and challenges were already examined. Scenarios for future privacy/security issues was produced, 6 national citizen consultations were made, a draft for privacy criteria for security research/technology was made too. As specific actions, they
interviewed directly 35 citizens of 5 European Countries to know public perception. Also they asked for expert advice to few stakeholders’ representatives.

At this workshop, the consortium expected to receive feedback from users to the criteria. They informed the participants of the background for the drafted criteria and they invited them to increase the value of the criteria together with the partners.

Regarding the role played by the CSOs that participated, they gave advice and their opinion about the proposal of the project to the European Commission about ‘how to promote a secure future for European citizens based on technologies and policies’.

Their activities were reactive based on giving their opinion but also they helped in the dissemination actions. They sent important outputs of the project to their associated and stakeholders.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
The CSOs did not play a key role in the project but the interviewee’s intervention was essential to the assessment about security technologies. The role of the CSOs was reactive for giving advice and opinion about their interest of the representatives.

From the interviewee’s experience, CSOs are well involved in security research projects in the FP7. The interviewee does not know any other role of CSOs in the FP7 framework. CSOs have the expected background and information needed to assess and give valuable inputs to the projects where they participated.

The interviewee thinks that it has to be improved the role of CSOs in EU projects to increase the societal impact of their outputs.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The role of the CSO allowed disseminating the organizations associated to the CSO. They disseminate the results. Participation in FP7 gave them also visibility and contacts with other stakeholders.

No evaluation was carried out to allow them for measuring the effectiveness of the results.

The interviewee said that CSOs shows always interest on being involved in the projects because it is important for them to give their opinion about certain research activities, influence their associates, to increase their network with other stakeholders and to influence in policies and research projects.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The impact was mainly obtained as an ‘influencer’ on research. The project involve directly providers of security technologies, private and public users and implementers, institutions and bodies shaping policies and regulations representing potentially and actually conflicting interests.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The CSO representative from a Foundation for Information Policy Research, an independent think-tank that studies the interaction between computers and society, and promotes public understanding and dialogue between UK and European civil society and policy-makers in the fields of e-commerce, copyright, law enforcement and national security, e-government, cryptography and digital signatures. The interviewee was appointed expert adviser to the UK parliament for the passage of three bills concerning privacy issues, and was co-organizer of the influential Scrambling for Safety public conferences on UK encryption and surveillance policy. This person might be interested to be interviewed.

Also, the interviewee talked about a Senior Fellow at Privacy International where the interviewee leads advocacy and research on anti-terrorism policies and international policy regimes.

**Keyword:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 25.

0. Introduction
The respondent works for the Spanish national agency for research, Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Industrial –CDTI in the area of security related research. The interviewee does not feel him/herself sufficiently familiar with the activities of CSOs. The interviewee knows that some of them are active, but he/she had very little interaction with CSOs. The link comes from the work carried out as one of the Security Theme National Contact Points of Spain for several years and the involvement at the EC’s monitoring committee of Security. The interviewee has only had contact with 2 CSOs during this period.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?
The interest and feedback from CSOs has been very limited. The interviewee believes that the activity of CSOs in security research is minimal. There is hardly any interest. However public authorities have not taken any specific action to stimulate getting involvement from CSOs.

The interviewee believes that CSOs develop relevant number of actions at national level, but very few at European level, step for which the interviewee believes should federate with each other.

On other FP7 issues, the interviewee believes that there is certainly a most important activity for CSOs. However there is a specific activity under the Security theme of special interest for CSOs in issues such as crisis management, biological threats, etc.

The most negative factor in the low involvement of the CSOS is the lack of professional permanent structures (expert staff) to promote their participation in EU programmes.

Specifically regarding European activities, another factor also affects: CSOs representatives do not see clear opportunities for intervention and financing; unlike what happens in other European policies, regional policy or development cooperation. No federative organization is specialized at European level. The CSOs must go through a process of reinforcing their capabilities. Where CSOs have played a role, although always reduced to date, is as observers and as users of research. In the future, CSOs could play a more active role as disseminators, actors of research and influencers.

CSOs are not sufficiently involved in networks at the European level; different is the case nationally. At European level, CSOs should be involved in more sectoralized fora. The interviewee does not believe that security is a specific criterion such as health, ICT, energy, etc. The respondent does not see clearly the security specificity.

There is no forum for stakeholders in security at European level. The respondent reminds that
security policy & programmes depends on DG Enterprise which is quite business-oriented. Topics with societal concerns are scarce. In order to have a greater role in Europe it is essential that CSOs go in partnership with other stakeholders, mainly public sector organizations.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?
The respondent refers primarily to the experience of a case: Fundación Salud por Derecho (Right to Health Foundation). The second case the respondent knows is ONCE, an important Spanish Foundation for the blind that manages a lottery, seeking advice to open a representative public affairs office in Brussels. However, the respondent only feels comfortable to refer to her experience related to the first case.

3. To what extent the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
Part of the elected representatives (not the staff) of the Salud por Derecho Foundation, due to their academic-related professional experience, were familiar with European programmes and they proposed that the CSO could actively intervene in FP7. The topic and theme chosen was not specifically security, nor health, which would be the theme more directly related to the CSO. It was the SSH programme. Under the project, the CSO conducted interviews, organised events and other communication and dissemination activities. Target for their activity were policy makers and civil society in general.

The motivation what led the CSO to get involved and commit to actively monitor FP7 in the past and H2020 in the future was the concern of the elected leaders of the Foundation. Once these leaders are replaced, the initiatives undertaken will not have an easy continuity because the Foundation has a very small staff (approx. 7 people) that are not specialized in European and research related issues that are only complementary and occasional for the Foundation.

The topics related to security that are primarily interesting for the Foundation are health risks and physical protection

The Foundation has tried to get involved in European programmes, especially development cooperation funds and Structural Funds. Their priorities are more easily fit into other programme frameworks, other than research FP.

Regarding the role played by the Foundation at European level, the respondent does not believe it could be proactive: acting as promoters of projects or other initiatives. The respondent see a more reactive oriented role for the CSO: supporting a lobbying activity but not leading it, participating in a project as a partner but not as a coordinator.

4. To what extent the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The activity of the Foundation was occasional in the field of FP7. The CSO did not play a key role in
the project. Its intervention was not essential to complete the project but obtained interesting outcomes. The respondent does not know if the project was internally assessed. The role of the Foundation was especially focused on dissemination.

All the activity related to the project was collateral to the principal activity of the Foundation, and clearly did not result in changes of its mainstream. The desire to remain active in European projects and contribute especially as influencers in H2020 was strengthened after their participation at the SSH project. The CSO assessed very positively their involvement in this FP7 project. Participation in FP7 gave them visibility and networking with other stakeholders.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The impact was mainly obtained as an actor of research. The ability to get results that can be transferred to its internal operations, to other organizations. Although it should be remembered that these results were mostly sociological. The respondent does not know if an impact evaluation of the project was made.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
The respondent does not suggest any name to be also interviewed.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; trans-CSO networking; project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 26.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is a manager at Fondation Sciences Citoyennes. The CSO aims to promote and extend the current movement of citizens and democratic appropriation of science, in order to bring the service of the common good.

Also, the interviewee is project partner at PERARES project that aim to strengthen public engagement in research (PER) by involving researchers and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in the formulation of research agendas and the research process.

The Foundation has a net of CSOs contacts that are: International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility, Living Knowledge – Improving Science Shop NETworking, European Network of Scientists for Social and Environmental Responsibility, Forum Mondial Sciences et Démocratie, Réseau Environnement Santé, Alliance pour une réglementation de transparence et d’éthique en matière de lobbying (ALTER-EU), Association de Veille et d’Information Civique sur les Enjeux des Nanosciences et des Nanotechnologies (AVICENN), Collectif des Associations Citoyennes. They work together in some projects and specific areas.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
They have been involved in two projects of security research that are PERARES and TRAMS. The last project, TRAMS, developed specific structural services for the International Science Shop Network Living Knowledge. The training and mentoring activities that have been developed in TRAMS fulfill an expressed need of Foundation Science Citoyenne, and provide a benefit for civil society, through the activities of the Science Shops and other Community-Based Research organizations that were involved in the Living Knowledge network.

Moreover, apart from the EC they have done a Guideline for CSOs to engage in European Commission projects that has been recently published and presented in a Forum in Rome.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
None of their experiences has been in security research in itself but can their experience can be interesting also for the aim of this interview. They have been involved mainly in defining how CSOs can work in research. They developed methodologies and guidelines.

The objectives are to pilot a novel form of research co-operation with CSOs, i.e. a continuous debate between research labs and CSOs, and to analyze this in order to learn from it and make an addition to the current toolbox developed for science shops.
They are satisfied because the actions developed are in line with their objectives as organization.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

They have been involved in several projects in FP6 and FP7 and now they are starting working in another project of H2020. They do not have an active position with the projects but they receive a lot of proposals and invitation to join consortiums in different fields.

They will be interested in joining a project related with nanotechnologies and security. They do not have a specific interest in security research as they have a horizontal view but the study of for example if nanotechnologies are a field of research interesting for the citizens and requested by the citizens would be interesting for them. The interviewee does not see his participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board because they have no time for such activities and do not have sufficient funding to make them interesting for them.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

Along their experience in research framework they are always been an actor of the research. In all the projects they have been involved as partners and actors of the research. They feel comfortable with this role and they do not think about being involved in another way for the moment.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

From their point of view, in order to facilitate CSOs engagement it is necessary to facilitate the management of the proposals and of the project itself. The interviewee says that it is too bureaucratic and it is needed to be more simply.

From their experience, it was difficult to understand from the very beginning how to use the Participant Portal or the information require from the organizations. So it will be useful to have a friendly tool or guideline for it.

Moreover, they have always focused their activity in a European level. So their activity or role in research of FP7 was clear for them. But the interviewee understands that not all CSOs can understand well the way to proceed for the first time.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

There are other CSOs involved in the Perares project as Science shops that can be interviewed. Also CSOs of their network.

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
0. Introduction
The interviewee is manager of psychosocial support at the Austrian Red Cross. Since 1990, the volunteer work in the Red Cross is an important part of his/her life. In 2006, the interviewee entered in the Red Cross to the training center. After years of working in the private sector he/she can contribute with her knowledge and experience as a trainer. The interviewee is part of the innovation department in Red Cross and has participated in a few projects in the FP7 security research as project partners.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has participated in several projects in security research of the FP7. The topics that interest most to the NGO are related with disaster management, risk, disable persons, mainly.

They have participated in security research project as:
- Innosec (INNOvation Management Models for SECurity Organizations) project that is addressing the need of European Security organisations for a significant change in innovation capacity through balancing a novel innovation model with a greater adaptation capacity in security organisations in order to respond effectively and efficiently to the security requirements of the European society.
- CPSI (Changing perceptions of security and interventions) project that aimed to create a methodology to collect, quantify, organise, query, analyse, interpret and monitor data on actual and perceived security, determinants and mediators.
- DRIVER (DRiving InnoVation in crisis management for European Resilience) a demonstration programme on aftermath crisis management.

Normally they had the role of end-user, part of the research of the project. Also, Austrian Red Cross has participated in several projects in FP7 framework but also in Life Long Learning among other and a few security research projects.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
In general de interviewee feels that their experience is very good because the projects were they participated were successful and the network did is also very valuable.

They know very well the role were the feel comfortable in projects. Also, they have lots of proposals to enter in consortiums so they can decide very well if those project are interesting or not for them, if they fit with the mission and vision of the Red Cross.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related
with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
They have been working in other research frameworks at national and European level that have
direct relation with disaster management. They have worked hard in FP7 and they are also starting
with H2020. They feel very active in research projects.

The interviewee does not see their participation as influencer, observer not even in advisory board
because they have no time for such activities and do not have sufficient funding to make them
interesting for them.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
They are happy been project partner, actor of the research as end-user. This is the role they have
been developing along a lot of years. The outputs of the projects are interesting for them and can
be implemented in their day to day work.

They do not think about doing other roles as observer or being an expert of another project. The
interviewee thinks that it is an individual interest that may have the employees of the Red Cross.

The interviewee wanted to explain that they have an innovation area in the organization with two
people full-time working in research projects. Their aim is mobilizing innovation projects related
with the mission and vision of the Red Cross in the way it has been doing in the past.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7
research?
The interviewee does not see any important issue to be ameliorated. Their experience in FP7
project is very good. The partners had a very good relation among each other and right now they
are using one of the products developed in a SR project in their daily work.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
It can be contacted the Red Cross regional headquarters that have also been involved in part of
the projects.

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 28.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is working honorary for the Berliner Fahrgastverband IGEB e.V. since 1993. Since 1996 the interviewee is part of the Administration, and since 2004 the interviewee is a manager. The interviewee is also the press officer for IGEB. The interviewee works together with media and newspapers to minimize the fear of citizens about being in public transport places. Security has been an issue for IGEB since ca. 10 years.

The interviewee did not have deep scientific knowledge about security research and FP7. Their major interest was in the field of surveillance in public transport places and to educate people about that in a more or less non scientific way. Security was an issue for them, but not research or security research, even though the interviewee already worked within a local research project in Berlin about subjective security perception (SuSi).

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The Berliner Fahrgastverband (IGEB) has never been involved in European security research. Furthermore security research on European level has not the biggest relevance for IGEB, as IGEB is mainly working on local level in Berlin. The main contacts are on local level, but there is one important contact on European level for IGEB who is a delegate in Brussels.

Nonetheless IGEB is generally interested to be involved in European security, but does not actively search for it. Until now IGEB has also not been asked from any institution or business partners to participate in any European security research.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewer did not ask to this question.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Besides the personal contact to Michael Cramer in Brussels, there is no institutionalized cooperation on European level. IGEB has never been involved in any activity or project cooperation related with FP7 or H2020, but there was at least one institutionalized involvement on local level: two years ago IGEB has been a project partner in the Project SuSi, about subjective security perception. The output of the project was a brochure. IGEB has long term partners within the Bundes- and Landespolizei, who were also project partners.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
IGEB would most like to be in the role of an influencer and disseminator, because they have a very
high interest in lobbying passenger interests within security research and giving important information to the passengers, too. We have our focus on the testing and dissemination of the respecting tasks, not so much in the direct research. We also want to act as a voice for public people and their concerns about security in public transport.

The most interesting fields of security for IGEB to work within would be the fields of resilience and surveillance. The most important issues for IGEB are: How do passengers perceive security, how can they feel more secure, without surveillance, but in a subjective way. IGEB wants to secure the sufficient information of passengers. IGEB is mainly interested in representing passengers and their rights.

The most important outcome for IGEB through participating in security research on European level would be to develop more Know-How in the security field. IGEB would like to receive important and interesting information, to distribute that information afterwards to the civil society. IGEB would like to work more as a consultant and as an interface between officials and private persons.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
Officials and public authorities should be aware of the importance of smaller CSOs and their interests on international level.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
- VCD (Verkehrsclub Deutschland);
- DBV (Deutscher Bahnkundenverband e.V.);
- Pro Bahn (Fahrgastverband Pro Bahn e.V.)

Keyword: priorities of security research; project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interview number 29.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is a manager of the Deutscher Feuerwehrverband e.V. (DFV). The DFV was created in 1853 and is the umbrella organization of the German Firefighters. The German Firefighters are divided in 16 federal groups, with each group working independent on their own laws/rules, research, technology development etc.. The DFV sees itself as a classical lobbyist for the German firefighters on national and EU level, with offices in Berlin and Brussels.

At the moment this interview was done, internally we accepted this organization could be considered as CSO. However, later, the project Consortium did not so.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The DFV has not been involved so far within European security research, but they are highly interested in participating. The main challenge for the DFV to participate on an EU-level is the federal structure of the German Firefighters Association. It is difficult to bundle the different opinions of the 16 federal groups and put them on an EU-level agenda. Each federal group has its own research advisory board.

Until now the DFV has not been asked to participate in European security and/or research. But the DFV has searched contact to the BMBF (Ministry for education and research) and the BBK (federal agency for civil protection and disaster prevention) on national level. The expert from BMBF recognized that the German Firefighters association did very rarely participate in security research until now, although they are much related to practice in security research. There is a good personal contact and the hope to do more security related research via this contact. On European level the DFV is building up contacts on different events in Brussels, e.g. the civil protection forum at the moment. The DFV did not receive specific invitations, but they know about some projects via newsletters and events. Those research projects were conducted through own initiative of individual staff.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewer did not ask this question.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No. But managed by the VFDB (Vereinigung zur Förderung des Deutschen Brandschutzes e.V.) there have been different security related projects on national and local level. One important ongoing project is titled EVA. The project deals with risks of big events, to design concepts for evacuation, rescue and assessment.
4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
There should be a special board for security research activities on EU level. The DFV would wish to be part of this board. Practical relevance is very important for the DFV. Many research activities do not grant this practical relevance.

The specific role, which the DFV would like to play, depends very much on the respective issue. The DFV is very flexible in this topic. The DFV wants to give practical expert inputs, no matter in which kind of role. So in this role we see ourselves as actors of research, but the DFV could also be a simple performer or disseminator of security research results.

The DFV is not interested in just one specific field of security, but in very different types of fields. The specific interest depends very much on the specific project. Firefighting security is a multilayered field that reaches from technology development, disaster management, over to psycho-traumatic healthcare and other ethical issues.

As a personal benefit from participation in security research, the DFV wants to help shaping the European security research area and get more influence also on international level. The DFV would like to be updated with the project and its outputs.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The DFV would welcome a simplification of the administration within EU level projects. Barriers for the personal ability to be involved in FP7 projects are the financial resources of the DFV for acquisition as well as the necessity of long term forward planning. On a wish-list to be better involved in FP7 the DFV would put more transparency, functioning interfaces, short ways, and a more active coordination, to know where, how and what is being researched.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
People to get in contact with other interested CSOs are:

- Dr Wolf Junker from BMBF;
- Dr Karsten Michael from BBK;
- VFDB (Vereinigung zur Förderung des Deutschen Brandschutzes e.V.) is mainly in charge of the research within the German Firefighters association.

Keyword: intra-CSO capability; inter-CSO networking: relationship with other CSOs; priorities of security research; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 30.

0. Introduction
Bundesgemeinschaft der Immigrantenverbände (BAGIV) is an umbrella organisation of migrant organisations in Germany, which deputises the interests of migrants in Germany, mainly on national and local level. This coalition of different German migrant associations exists since more than 25 years and has ca. 1000 associations under its roof. Their main interests are in the fields of civil society and politics and they have worked within different local, national and international projects in those fields. Topics of these projects have been questions about integration, mobility, discrimination etc. The interviewee is a manager of BAGIV and is working in an honorary capacity.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
No. Security issues are just important for a few persons within BAGIV and that is why BAGIV more tends to leave security issues to other organisations/stakeholders. It is just a secondary issue for BAGIV, but on national level there have been scientific projects in the field of boarder security.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
Depending on the specific issue BAGIV could give a good input, because of their special point of view and achieve a satisfying representation of migrant interests. BAGIV could bring in their special juridical expertise, especially in the field of boarder security and ethical/religious issues and complement these fields.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Besides national level projects, there are members of BAGIV who worked in FP7 projects in the fields of mobility (mobility and faculty against discrimination), education and with refugees. These activities got initiated by individual persons, that made the whole acquisition process on own initiative.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
An involvement would ideally be as ethical consultant. BAGIV has a very specific view on security issues and they could help within the R&D process to rethink certain developments, because of new aspects (for example full-body scanners at airports are a big problem also from special religious viewpoints. BAGIV can be a simple adviser, but they also want to be actively involved in the research process.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
An involvement on eye level for CSOs in Europe-wide calls and projects has not been possible for a long time. This is only recently possible (H2020) and there was no good opportunity for BAGiV until now.

There are still structural difficulties, especially for financing the whole application process. Especially this aspect needs to be improved.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
There are different ethical organisations that might be interesting, for example Türkische Gemeinde Deutschland, or welfare organisations, like CARITAS.

**Keyword:** project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 31.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is project manager for security research within the Studiengesellschaft für den kombinierten Verkehr (SGKV). The SGKV is a research association founded in 1928. The SGKV aims to foster the rational transportation of goods in Germany and Europe (environmental-friendly, efficient and sustainable designs based on intelligent and intermodal transport chains). Part of this efficiency support is security research in the field of transportation security.

The interviewee was very keen about security research on national, but also on European level. The interviewee saw the main problems for participation on European level in the already existing lobby and closed networks, and in the high costs to file applications for EU funded projects.

At the moment of the interview it was unclear to consider this organization as a CSO what is reflected in the model of questionnaire used.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Yes, the SGKV was a project partner in the FP7 project IMCOSEC - Integrated approach to IMprove the supply chain for COntainer transport and integrated SECurity simultaneously. It was a one year project running from April 2010 till the end of March 2011. The project was the first of two planned phases to improve supply chain security on international level, while assuring free trading conditions. The main reason for the SGKV to participate in this project was, to bring in their practical knowledge about supply chains and regarded security issues.

There has been one important contact for the participation of SGKV within IMCOSEC that was arranged through the former CEO of SGKV, who had personal contacts to the Forschungs- und Anwenderverbund FAV-Berlin. The FAV-Berlin built a consortium for IMCOSEC and organized the whole application process.

The role of SGKV during this project was in the field of coordination and support of action. The SGKV has worked as a port between theoretical work and practical actions.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The most important achievement for SGKV was the establishment of a new network for the SGKV on European level. The SGKV managed to work more interdisciplinary than before.

The main goal within the project for the SGKV was to do desk research, produce texts and develop new approaches for the security of supply chains. Within their research group the SKGV was able to push the practical aspects of the research forward, which was in their interest. Furthermore the
results led to additional research projects with different topics than IMCOSEC, but only on national level. As the project IMCOSEC had a planned second phase, for which the SGKV was applying, but not getting accepted, this refusal was dissatisfying.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The SGKV was not involved in any other FP7/H2020 activities. But on national level there were at least two projects outside the security research theme: SefLog and ADEPT, both funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). One former partner from the FP7 project IMCOSEC was also participation within those projects.

The SGKV seems to be too small for EU-projects, especially when it comes to application issues, they do not have a sufficient time and money frame. Acquisition is none of their everyday business. The administrational afford is simply too high (from developing ideas, to financial reporting etc.). SGKV was applying for 4-5 projects on EU-level, but they never succeeded. It seems that already existing project-consortia are a barrier for small applicants/organizations.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The role as coordinator and support of actions was all right for the SGKV. To associate the analytical processes and the practicability is a good focus for the SGKV. Often the focus of the research projects is on technologies, but the SGKV would also like to work more on staff and organizational aspects.

The most interesting fields for the SKGV are: transport-security, economical aspects of transportation and public transport.

The SKGV would like to get better integrated in already existing networks, instead of creating new ones.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The acquisition should be made easier for small organizations with low capacities. There should be financial help for the application process. Only 30% funding is too less, and the administration effort is not getting financed at all. Time and standing are big problems; often the time for applications and for the whole project is too short. Another problem are the lobbies in Brussels, that already occupy many projects from the early beginning, so that it is not worth it, to apply for those projects.

Target-oriented conferences, about the different calls and possibilities of participation could save a lot of time for applying organizations. The integration in already existing networks has to be easier.
It is very attractive for the SGKV to be part of an advisory board, because they don’t have to do any application work, which means a minimal afford, but they can profit a lot by very short participations in terms of networking and knowledge acquisition.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

Other CSOs for interviews could be:

• BIGS (Brandenburgisches Institut für Gesellschaft und Sicherheit);
• VDI (Technologiezentrum) GmbH.

Keywords: project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 32.

0. Introduction
The DRK is the national umbrella-association of free welfare-and social work as well as an, authorized by federal government, auxiliary in charge of national disaster control (e.g. coordination of foreign assignments). The DRK is the national Red Cross-Organization in Germany and is part of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

The interviewee is a manager of the security research department within the higher authority team (No 23) “civil protection and honorary”, which are as well the focused issues regarding the research projects the interviewee is responsible for. Main tasks of the department are to initiate, support and document processes of innovation- and strategy-development within the DRK.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The DRK is directly involved in two current FP7-SEC projects: COBACORE (Community Based Comprehensive Recovery; 2013-04-01 to 2016-03-31) and CRISMA (Modelling crisis management for improved action and preparedness; 2012-03-01 to 2015-08-31). The first project the DRK took part is already completed (A4A – Alert for All; 2011-03-16 to 2013-12-15). Next to the integration in European projects the DRK attends in various national and international research cooperation’s, especially in the role of the “end-user”. Also does the DRK have several departments (e.g. disaster management) that are involved in security issue research (main focus on civil protection).

A reason to start working in FP7-SEC for the DRK has been the question “which profit could the DRK get from participating in EU-Projects?” The DLR (Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt) was the initiator for DRK to start in FP7-SEC, all following projects got initiated by networks from the first project.

The main role of the DRK has been as end user, with the tasks of final evaluation and running of test sets for the project. But they also acted as evaluators in cooperation with other partners and gave technical advises, for example in the field of engineering requirements.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research?
Are you satisfied with the results so far?
A highly motivated interest is having the possibility to get a deeper insight in a variety of perspectives regarding a multi-faceted issue such as civil protection. It is also an added value in this respect to get impulses from the outside environment. Another benefit comes with the provided resources that can be used to get engaged in subject areas that are as well important but usually put last. As the DRK- focus is on the “appliance part” of research the organization has the chance to make internal recommendations to improve their strategy.
Furthermore the DRK could benefit from important new insights in the fields of resources management, resilience and societal development. The different co-operations also led to a consistent internal development.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Within the “European civil protection mechanism calls” the DRK has been involved in a project called WINCAP. This project participation got arranged by the international Red Cross office in Brussels.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The role the DRK assumes is an ideal position although the funding is expandable. Still the interviewee criticizes the current situation regarding issues such as the difficulty to deal with shifts in research-focus (as the project-approval takes a lot of time) and the EU-bureaucracy in general (uses almost 50% of the monetary and time resources). The DRK would like to mainly focus on social welfare work.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
One important issue is the kind of project financing that plays a major role referring to the application. An improvement regarding the subject of the EU-calls would be to make them more unambiguous and purposeful. Talking about innovation in general it is easier to make room for it having just a small consortium. The interviewee is really interested in finding possibilities to support follow-up financing and follow-up projects to stay in the same field of main focus.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
Other (big) aid organizations (e.g. DLRG, Malteser, Johanniter, ASB).

Keywords: project participation assessment; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 33.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is in different positions within the Austrian Red Cross ÖRK. His main activity is as federal rescue commander and the interviewee is also engaged as head of the departments of operation, innovation and involvement. The ÖRK is the national Red Cross-Organization in Austria and is part of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. It is the biggest aid agency in the country. The ÖRK has been a partner in many project on different fields of activity and with different geographical scopes. The main focus within the security field is on civil protection and the involvement of civil society as active partners in security technology development.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The ÖRK has been directly involved in two FP7-SEC projects: INNOSEC (INNOvation Management Models for SECurity Organizations) started on February 2012 and finished on February 2014. IDIRA (Interoperability of data and procedures in large-scale multinational disaster response actions) started in May 2011 and has a duration of four years. An affiliated company of the ÖRK was also participating in a FP7-SEC project called DRIVER (Driving Innovation in Crisis Management for European Resilience).

There were two main ways how the ÖRK started within FP7 projects: The usual way is writing applications together with important contacts/partners (like Frauenhoferinstitut and OeAD). The other way is, that the ÖRK gets approached as an enduser by already existing consortia/projects, what happend in the project INNOSEC.

Their usual role within the projects is as classical end user, or as advocate of end users. The ÖRK was also acting as researcher and moderator within consortia.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The involvement of the populace in technical and social security development is of very high interest for the ÖRK. Their understanding of participation and involvement of civilians within research could also emphasize other research partners. This goal was especially reached within the project DRIVER.

Important benefits for the ÖRK have been in terms of network-building and to get to know and learn from the different policies in different European countries.

The ÖRK also put attention to different gaps of security research, which seemed to have had a long-term influence on the agenda of H2020 security research program.
3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The ÖRK is working in a whole host of projects in FP7/H2020 and on national and regional level outside the security research theme. Activities in the fields of civil protection outside of security research have been part of the work of ÖRK since the early beginning of work in those fields. The ÖRK is working in security research just since 10-12 years.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The ÖRK would like to be involved as an equal partner in consortia. They do not want to be just a classical end user, but also shape and co-create R&D. The ÖRK would like to bring in their practical knowledge for R&D to help both, researchers and industry. The ÖRK hopes to develop, get to know and to use new products and new standards of security.

The ÖRK does not want to deliver results and readymade technology to citizens, but they want to integrate citizens in the development process. They want to strengthen the integrating character of research. Furthermore the ÖRK prefers to work with soft facts than within product development. The ÖRK does not want to work in the fields of criminology, forensics or boarder security. They like to work in the fields of civil protection and vulnerability of societies.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The ÖRK does not want to work with dual-use technologies, which could get used for military purposes, too. They do not want to work with dubious partners. The consortia should be balanced in terms of participating partners (same amount of academics, Industry and end user). The projects have to be sufficiently financed.

Often times the social science component is missing. Societal impact and resilience analysis are important issues for the ÖRK, and they wish to do more research in this direction.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The Red Cross organizations from other European countries.

Keyword: priorities of security research; project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 34.

0. Introduction
The German European Security Association e.V. (GES A) is a German CSO acting as a network, communicator and political discourse initiator. GESA was created in 2007 and supports a civil security architecture of Germany and Europe in order to protect a democratic value system. They are not a CSO in a classical sense. Their goal is to structure the field of civil security research and issues. A main question for GESA is: how to bring the different actors of security research together? They started with solving this problem on national level, but moved very fast over to European level.

The interviewee has been a member of GESA through his old employer and became a staff member of GESA with the work on the FP7-SEC project ARCHIMEDES.

Exceptionally, two interviews were held with the same person (#11 and #34). They have not been integrated in the same template. Interviewers were different and emphasis is paid in different aspects.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
GES A has been involved in the project ARCHIMEDES, which ran from 01.01.2012 – 31.12.2014. Its mission is to increase the security R&T uptake in Europe by focusing on end-users & operators’ needs and involvement in the innovation cycle. The project was led by the European Organisation for Security (EOS). The scope of the project has not been in a specific security field, because the aim was the development of an innovation management tool for the whole civil security research area.

The development of the project was led and seared by EOS with the other consortia partners from 2006-2007 until 2011. GESA was also involved in the project development. First contacts to be part of this consortium were private contacts of the former CEO of GESA.

GES A has been the smallest project-partner, in the role of an end user. They were very important for the project, because they have been the only partner with experiences in innovation management, namely in the person of the interviewee. GESA has been a role model for structuralizing and how to bring research, end user and technology together (round table). They also worked on more specific innovation-contents.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The specific issue of innovation management in security has personally been a new topic for the interviewee, when the interviewee was introduced to the project ARCHIMEDES. The interviewee
had very high expectation from the project, which were not completely fulfilled in the end. The interviewee was hoping to reach an innovation in the security landscape, but at least the project was able to give a structuralized overview of the complex area of security research. Academically the project was very satisfying, but not on practical level.

Conceptual, there were three essential goals in ARCHIMEDES. First: to validate the existing research frame. Second: to find best practice examples. Third: to develop an innovation tool. The results of the first two goals have been satisfying, but the third goal was in the end impossible to reach, which was also an important finding.

Within the project consortium GESA could take influence on conceptual and theoretic level, but not for steering. GESA became an important example for the development of round tables within the project. Furthermore GESA was profiting from the identification of different topics in the FP7-SEC fields and their own position within.

Personally the interviewee was able to strengthen the European Network.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No, and there is no particular interest, as GESA is only working with civil security issues.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
GESAs as a political user is aimed at the industry and wants to supply their political demand. So their ideal position is as a communicator between the policy makers and the industry within the security research field.

GESA wants to be a project partner from the early beginning of a project and not as a simple test-user in the end. It is very important to be part of the whole research process and also get the allowance for this.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
CSOs need a co-financing and supporting organizations (such as GESA) for the coordination, especially at the stage of application, planning and so on. The institutional frame needs to be changed, especially in terms of finances and the required time for run (at least one and a half year before the start of a project, which is a time frame that is only possible for huge associations, enterprises and Universities), but also in terms of clear structures.

The end users of security research cannot be on the supply, as well as on the demand side of the security research process. The interviewee suggests outsourcing the integration of end users form research-projects and developing special partner relations.
6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

Other interesting CSOs could be:

- Technisches Hilfswerk (THW)
- Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund
- Animal welfare associations with interests in civil protection.
- Environmental NGOs like BUND
- Deutsche Industrienorm e.V. (DIN)

**Keywords:** project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 35.

0. Introduction
The interviewee and her scientific team are coordinating the raise of third-party funding for the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP) - German Institute for International and Security Affairs. The CSO has the legal form of foundation and was created in 1962. This work scops the consultation of the scientific staff, administrational help with project application and implementation, as well as dissemination inclusive reporting, and cross-referencing etc.

The SWP in general is primarily dealing with issues of disarmament, but also with a broad spectrum of analysis ranging from classic security policy issues to aspects of climate protection and the political challenges associated with resource scarcity. The SWP is mainly working in order of the Bundestag and the German Federal Government, but also for economic actors and the general public.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Yes. Since 2011 the SWP was working within diverse cooperation projects in the field of security research, also projects financed by the European Commission. The contents of those projects were the main reason to work within them, because they fitted well with the issues the SWP is working with.

The SWP was working in the fields of peace, military, foreign political strategies, cyber security, and geopolitical defined security questions. The role of the interviewee within those projects was third-party coordination (administrative coordination and contextual- and research strategic advisement.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
Security research is the main working field of the SWP, because of that it is hard to say which special achievements have been made. In the first case the SWP could scale up the outreach of security questions, they could extend their scientific staff and also the database they are working with.

The SWP was mainly dealing with data-analysis and field-research. Through those fields the SWP could construct a big database, which opened the doors for deeper analysis of security issues.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No. The SWP is focused on security issues and is not really interested in any other research fields.
4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The willingness from sides of the SWP to work within cooperation projects is only given, if the projects are relevant for the research profile of the SWP. The SWP likes to participate as lead, but also as co-applicant. The SWP likes to work mainly in the fields of peace, military, and security politics.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
- Better communication channels to the FP7 administration;
- Lower administrative effort;
- Comprehensible rules and standards with administrative processes.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee does not suggest names.

Keywords: project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 36.

0. Introduction
The organization is the Eastern Europe Studies Center - EESC, being a non-governmental, non-profit organization established by the Vilnius University in 2006, considering the organization as a think tank, aiming to build civil society and promote democracy in Eastern Europe by monitoring and researching political, economic, and social developments in the region, and by developing qualitative analyses. It organizes conferences, seminars, and round-table discussions regarding issues relevant to civil society and democracy; it trains people in areas relevant to its mission; and it also offers consultations and recommendations to individuals and organizations cooperating with Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia.

The organization specializes in the EU Eastern neighborhood policy. The organization is functioning both as a nonprofit institution and as a research institute. Being focused on research, the organization needed to register, to get an accreditation for researching from the Ministry of Education. The organization is structured in 2 divisions: Policy Analysis and Research Division and Civil Society Development and Cooperation Division. The policy analysis and research division’s work focuses on the Eastern Partnership countries and Russia. Even that almost the entire work of the organization is being focused on Europe, they had also a global focus/action: in Burma and in Afghanistan. The project from Burma was developed in a partnership with colleagues from Czech Republic. The one in Afghanistan lasted for 4 years, consisting in trainings for Lithuanian military troops, with a civilian element (trainings for local government). The policy analysis is mostly addressing Lithuanian foreign policy, transatlantic relations, Russia, and Eastern Partnership countries research.

The networks in which they activate:
- the organization is participating to EU-Russia Civil Society Forum;
- member in Friends of Europe;
- member in the Association of Lithuanian development organizations.

The organization is funded by different European funds, but also national funds. In 2007 the organization has expanded its field of activity by establishing the Democracy and Development Assistance Fund. Its fundamental aim is to promote Freedom and Democracy in the Eastern Europe by strengthening cooperation across the borders and building networks in the region.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has not been involved in FP7 projects. They have, however, participated to a seminar about FP7 and they found it very discouraging for the organizations, because the FP7 projects were ‘advertised’ as very big projects, for strong and well established institutions and consortia, one indirect message being that the new Member States cannot expect to lead any
projects, but to be only partners. So with this background, it was hard to find partners or become one. Regarding the H2020, a consultancy organization has invited the organization to participate in a project for Eastern Partnerships and Research, but at the moment it is only at the ‘invitation’ stage, nothing else has been done in this direction.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
Taking into consideration the fact that they have not participated (yet) in this kind of projects, it is hard to state the achievements. In the future, this involvement in this kind of project is beneficial, in the sense that it will develop more partnerships to share their know-how with.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
They have been invited, but the project has not started yet. When thinking back to the first contact we FP7, the seminar which took place 5 years ago, the interviewee wasn’t so sure why they didn’t go further, but was almost sure that they were too busy developing the organization. This came with a lack of pro activeness in finding partners, in finding more information and they were not part of any consortium, so they were kind of doing researches funded by the Lithuanian government with some partners from Germany or Poland, but not part of big consortiums.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The organization is ready now to be a leading organization in a project. They have the capacity on managing a big project and they have the know-how concerning the Eastern region. Of course, the interviewee is aware of the possible bureaucratic technical constraints “your budget shouldn’t be less then...” But, the organization has big know how on the region development and is being seen, by the consultancy companies as an asset. “We still have everything on our hands, we were going through all this transitions and we know how to do this.”

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
From their experience, aware that this represents more like a business for the big structures, organizations, consultancy companies: “they know how to write, they have all the criteria”.

From the interviewee point of view, it wasn’t only that the information was too complicated, hard to understand and presented and in a complicated manner, but also the CSOs should be also more proactive in getting the right information concerning the projects and start approaching other stakeholders to initiate projects. Also, the cooperation with consultancy organizations will increase the ability to be involved in H2020.

Now the organization it seemed that it reached that level which makes it a potential partner or leader of big projects.
6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee does not suggest other names.

**Keywords**: intra-CSO capability.
Interviewee number 37.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is involved in the direction of the Hungarian Association for Migrants (Menedek), founded in 1995. Since 1998, the association is dealing with social issues related to integration of the migrants (refugees and asylum seekers), migration in general (lately from Hungary) and returned migrants.

The association works on 4 pillars:

- **Direct service** – the association has 7 operational units working that help:
  - providing consultancy to immigrants, refugees and asylum seeker;
  - providing psychological aid (sometimes psychiatric).
- **Training** – education for professionals, NGOs, government officers, teachers, security personnel working in detention service, police, etc. The training courses are on:
  - general professional competencies;
  - intercultural competencies, communication skills;
  - education in multi-ethnic schools.
- **Direct work** – working with the communities (organizing community activities for children, cultural events, exhibitions, field trips, etc.)
- **Advocacy and policy making** – as part of the national administration.

In terms of affiliations and strong cooperation, the CSO is part of / cooperating with:
- ECRE – European Council on Refugees and Exiles;
- Migration Policy Group;
- UNITED – The international network against nationalism, racism;
- Hungarian Anti-Poverty Network (part of the European Anti-Poverty Network).

In terms of funding, the CSO is funding its activity by accessing funds from: the refugee fund, DG Justice, Europe for Citizens, DG Education.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The association has never been approached to be part of such projects. The interviewee spoke from his personal experience as researcher, consultant, trainer in migration and social integration. The interviewee was a consultant for MIPEX (Migrant Integration Policy Index) [www.mipex.eu](http://www.mipex.eu).

The interviewee took part (independently from the association) in one FP6 project on security research called CHALLENGE - The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security-, with the Center for the European Policies in Brussels and is more involved in such projects. The interviewee is affiliated to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The organization is conducting researches, but it was not involved in security research/security type of projects (funded by FP7). The interviewee has personal experience in FP6 and FP7 funded projects that have a connection with migration. As mentioned above, the organization is funded by other programs.

As for the organization involvement, it is very important to stick to its mandate, which is dedicated to international migration (illegal residence, border crossing) and integration (minorities’ rights, inter-ethnic communities, asylum). In these areas the CSO has competence and can take part to projects that are connected with this aspect (and connected with security).

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

No; the organization was not invited/approached so far to take part to projects funded by FP6 or FP7.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The ideal involvement brought the discussion to the roles that the CSO considers that would be important to have:

- To be more influential over the research design in the initial phase, in general (what should be investigated and what not);
- To be able to obtain first-hand information (to have data and information access beyond the general dissemination).

As the interviewee stated “almost everything would be possible, if we speak technically”.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

When speaking about the barriers / the involvement of CSOs, the interviewee thinks that CSOs in general have different activities that might or might not relate with security issues. Also, researchers and administration have more information and access to specific data than the CSOs.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

No; the interviewee didn’t know to recommend other CSOs that were already approached by the consortium (organizations from its own country).

Keywords: inter-CSO networking; priorities of security research.
Interviewee number 38.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is involved in the direction of Artemisszio Foundation, which has been operating since 1998 as a non-profit organization of public interest. The CSO is aiming to achieve its objectives through the research, promotion and use of the theory and practice of intercultural communication.

Its goals are:

- To encourage continuous dialogue and interaction between culturally, ethnically and socially diverse groups and to foster their mutual understanding;
- To support the social integration of socially and culturally disadvantaged groups;
- To strengthen scientific and cultural relations internationally;
- To develop and disseminate intercultural training courses, educational materials and methods.

The CSO is part of different networks:

- Networks that deal with youth mobility;
- Hungarian umbrella of NGOs for development and humanitarian aid (HAND);
- RAN – Radicalization Awareness Network - not a member, but (still) considering if to join it.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Not related to security research. The CSO connection with FP7 is described in Q3.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewee has not participated in security or research.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The organization took part to a bid, within a FP7 funded project, ran by a British organization, as experts on Islam and Fundamentalism, as Hungary has a very big Islamic community.

The CSO has also participated in a project on Right Extremism, Hate speech and Hate acts – they have only been involved in some of the project’s activities, not as a partner.
There were no other FP7-related experiences.

The CSO had considered twice getting involved, but at the end it didn’t go further. What they (people from the CSO) understood, was that so to have chances, they need to “join hands” with the universities.

There are not enough human and financial resources in the CSOs. The tendency, to the European
funding, is to address things to a bigger scale, at a European level. Because of this fact, the CSOs do not struggle to work better, but struggle to survive.

Connected with the lack of involvement of CSOs, the interviewee gave an example from what is happening with Europe Aid programme. Since last year, some major changes have been made and the impression is that EC has not so many human resources to deal with small projects. So, it becomes difficult for some (especially small sized) CSOs to apply.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee would like to be involved in the research part, on formulating opinions, especially on the rising extremism issues.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
In terms of roles, the interviewee said that they can and would want to be involved as researchers and outside observers.

The interviewee considers that linking CSOs with other entities (academia, research institutions, etc.) is a good idea, because of the diversity that can be found.

The CSO is interested in security, but the interviewee mentioned that if it is about how immigration is treated / viewed from the security perspective, then this would come against the main focus / mission of the CSO. But if it would be about rising of extremism and security, then this represents an issue of interest for the organization.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee didn’t know to recommend any other persons besides the ones that were already on the list to be contacted.

Keywords: inter-CSO networking; trans-CSO networking; priorities of security research.
Interviewee number 39.

0. Introduction
The organization is the Estonian Fund for Nature (ELF) and is focused on environment. The foundation was established in 1991, and from 1999 it is working as a proper foundation with active projects. Its main concern is nature and nature preservation in Estonia. They are developing a marine program, a program dedicated to the wetlands. It is an organization that works with 15 to 20 employees (scientists) and more long and short term volunteers, depending on the projects they implement. They are focusing on wildlife habilitation, wild animals’ life and security (animals, who, for example, are involved in accidents and which they are trying to help). The main funding the foundation gets comes from state-centered funding (approx. 80%) and it finances itself through projects/project based (local and European level).

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Neither the interviewee, nor the organization has been involved in European security and/or research.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The organization has not participated in security and/or research.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The organization has expertise in environmental issues and would contribute from this perspective. They would be interested if they would know if they actually are part of the target group, but they thought is more for universities. “We are not mainly a researcher organization, more like a lobby organization, but we do research. We do more disseminating, risk assessment and so on.” “I don’t know why we wouldn’t though it”. In terms of benefits, the most obvious ones which were named: to have resources to fund their activities, to pay the salaries and then to make the research data known to the general public.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
- receiving more contacts where the organization can get information from and with whom the information can be disseminated
- A smaller percentage of co-funding
- A data base with all the organizations involved, where they can find partners
Their willingness to get involved will increase if they would know more on the requirements.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
No.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; inter-CSO networking.
Interview number 40.

0. Introduction
The CSO is called Sustainable Development Initiatives – DVI and was founded in 2007 and the interviewee is the director of this CSO. The organization is project based and its main focus is on environmental issues, developing a series of activities: local action groups on topics of interest for the organization, building capacities at rural level, actions on climate change, policy changes at national level, public environmental education (on sustainability issues).

The organization is part of the:
- National environment coalition;
- National NGO coalition;
- Climate Action Network Europe.

In terms of funding, the organization obtains funding from NGO budget lines, structural funds (cohesion funds), Environmental grants, and small grants from municipalities.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
No, the organization was not involved.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
It is not the case.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No, the organization was not invited to take part.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee was not clear that the CSOs (at least) can have a role in this type of projects.

But still, if they would be invited, the organization could play important roles as disseminator, influencer (due to its experience of work with national institutions and of the access and knowledge of public opinion on the topic of interest for the organization).

In general, depending on the topic of the project, the organizations can be involved as experts or developers.

The interviewee believes that in order to be involved better, maybe more research experience would be needed.
5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The interviewee declared that it depends a lot on the topic of the projects and how the call for applicants is being developed.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee didn’t know to recommend anyone.

Keywords: project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 41.

0. Introduction

The CSO is called Institute for Electronic Participation (INePA) an independent, not for profit, non-governmental organisation professionally oriented on eDemocracy, eParticipation, eGovernance and eInvolvement. The organization's mission is to contribute to development of democracy with socially innovative use of Internet by citizens, civil society, institutions and decision-makers. The organization’s activities: digital democracy activities, with a focus on political informatics, active citizenship, political participation, democratic challenges of digital society, open government and civic dialogue by means of consultation, studies, lectures, advocacy, networking, web solutions, participatory design, citizens sourcing, facilitation, stakeholders involvement, results delivery and dissemination.

The organization is a member of the Pan European eParticipation Network (PEP-NET), the Central and Eastern Europe Citizens Network (CEE CN), the Centre for Information Service, Co-operation and Development of NGOs in Slovenia (CNVOS) and is listed among key actors in eParticipation developments (the European eParticipation Study 2009).

Also, the CSO is the coordinator of the Slovenian National Network of NGOs active in information society (OGP – open government partnership, open data, cybersecurity). Among the reasons for creating a network were: a need for a greater public involvement in research and application of information and communication technologies, as they are bringing many digital risks for every day life’s of people such as digital control, privacy, surveillance etc.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The organization has not been involved in security research projects. The organization has participated in other type of European projects / consortia in the area of the Internet for citizens’ participation such as www.puzzledbypolicy.eu (ICT-PSP programme), www.vidi-project.eu (eParticipation programme) and www.ourclimate.eu (European Parliament pilot project). In the PUZZLE project, the organization was involved for 3 years (2010-2013). Within this project an online platform was developed in order to support discussions on migration issues in Europe: education of migration; Facebook and policy profiler. They were leaders of one of the Work Packages.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The achievements of the projects come more in the form of feedback towards the Consortium. Some of the questions raised have an answer in the form of future actions, some of them are more like a signal to take into consideration for future projects:

- The CSO got more attention from the project’s activities targeting NGOs. This translates into
the fact that the Consortium should include NGOs that work in the field of migration at European level, because they have a more concrete access in this field;

- More funding to increase the NGOs involvement and the subcontractors;
- The Consortium was not very good at disseminating the results to the public – the projects do not have a positive impact on the improvement of the quality of life;
- The quality of the project would have been improved if migration NGOs would have been involved from the very beginning. They pushed for changes regarding the budget, so to be able to have specialized NGOs as subcontractors;
- The need of an evaluation of the quality of the project;
- EC is not really good in disseminating the results, especially in e-participation; it puts a lot of pressure on the partners to provide a business plan, but not everything can be translated in terms of ‘public client’.

In terms of lessons learned - the main lesson learned from collaborating with other partners such as SMEs, academia and public administrations was that NGOs are highly under-represented in 7FP programmes, although they can provide added value in performing some key functions of the 7FP projects such as problem definition, citizens / user’s involvement, piloting and dissemination. The CSO has created a short expert article (The challenges of NGOs collaboration with enterprises and academia in the European projects) on that issue which is available in Slovene language: http://www.inepa.si/component/content/article/179-izzivi-sodelovanja-nevladnih-organizacij-z-gospodarstvom-in-znanostjo-na-evropskih-projektih.html

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

The organization has very specific target activities that do not relate very much with the FP7 (or related) themes. This is not because of the low interest in the security research theme, but more because of the lack of capacity and human resources to deal with other fields of work. However, the organization is very interested in future collaborations, as long as this does not interfere with the goals of their own goals and timing.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The involvement will take the following forms (roles):

- National field problem identification – problems related to everyday life people;
- Piloting the solutions and testing new types of collaboration;
- Information and dissemination about the project itself, results and future opportunities;
- Direct involvement in the research;
- Advocacy and influencing public policies (these two are more like side-roles).

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The interviewee considers that there are a lot of issues that should be worked upon:
To improve the administration of resources – reporting, preparing project proposals, briefings (all these administrative aspects take a lot of time and require human resources focused only on these issues). The solution would be to make everything more simple, but without losing the control of the project (and the interviewee has few ideas of how this can be done);

The funding is not for every CSO – just because it takes a lot of resources from the NGO (human resources), the small organizations stand no chance from the very beginning, even if they would have a lot of input to the project;

To improve the transparency of the project and call writing process – when a call is made, some of the parties that could be involved cannot participate because the call does not include them. There should be made a better public definition of the processes which lead to the final call, in order to improve the participation opportunities of the organizations. Solution – a public debate before the call is made, with potential participants, so that they know ahead and get prepared or improve the call’s requirements.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
An expert cooperating with Transparency International Slovenia, involved in influencing the draft government strategy on cyber-security.

Keywords: involvement in project execution; trans-CSO networking; project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 42.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is an independent expert that initially worked in the field of International Relations and European Studies in Slovenia. The interviewee worked as a project manager at Biotech and now the interviewee has shifted to the CSO sector (after working in the private sector). The interviewee has participated, as individual independent consultant and team leader, in EU research programs, as collaborator.

In the past years, the interviewee’s interest moved to the CSOs working in the field of International relations, public transparency, human rights, privacy and information in technology.

The interviewee chose to speak more from the personal perspective and less from the CSO perspective, refusing to name these organizations, but only their fields of activity:

- transparency;
- international relations;
- human rights;
- privacy;
- information in technology.

1. What is your opinion about the CSO involvement in European security research related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020?

The interviewee has participated in public discussion regarding security and research. At this point, the interviewee mentioned that in Slovenia the Government has the obligation to talk about security strategies with the public and the civil society. During this meeting, it has been brought to the Government’s attention the changing of the way cyber security is organized in Slovenia. Another proposal came in the direction of bringing in new levels of citizens’ control, apart from the political control (civilian control, with the direct participation of the citizens).

Another reason why the CSOs are not so involved in these projects is that the institutions are not eager to share information related to security research.

2. Do you have the experience / knowledge of a particular CSO involved in security research under Framework Programme 7?

The interviewee is already involved and in the past played many roles. At this point the interviewee chose to point important aspects regarding the public and civil society involvement by the authorities.

The interviewee was involved only personally, as a collaborator and independent consultant. The interviewee has participated, as individual, in EU research programs, as collaborator, independent
consultant and team leader. The interviewee has published a research paper in the Security field, but she did not take part in any projects. The interviewee has been involved in research in the social scientific direction, and not so much in the direction of new technologies.

3. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO has been relevant?
Activity of CSOs has been relevant by making opinions known, experience sharing, influencing the agenda.

4. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO achieved effective results?
The interviewee believes that if the EU is concerned about involving more the CSOs in the security research area, then there should be done a public contest/public invitation to work with certain representatives of CSOs on the projects. This way, the institutions involved in the actual research will get an opinion from the CSOs side. Involving the civil society from the very beginning will bring the EU in contact with the citizens.

The increased involvement of the CSOs in FP7/H2020 projects would be very beneficial. Unfortunately, CSOs are not well informed and they are not taken as partners by other institutions. Plus, national security matters are confidential. Improving all these aspects will increase the ability of being involved in FP7 research.

5. To what extend the activity of this particular CSO impacted on society?
The participation of CSOs in the field of security research is very limited. Some of the reasons include that the public institutions (universities, mostly) seek to get projects on their own, without the involvement of other bodies, in order to keep the funding for themselves, whereas the CSOs don’t have everything calculated in terms of finances.

6. Do you think the representatives of these particular CSOs might be willing to be interviewed?
Already interviewed the person recommended.

**Keywords:** project participation assessment; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interview number 43.

0. Introduction
The Foundation for an Open Society was established in 1990 and represents one of the biggest organizations in Romania. The organization’s main domains of interest are: migration (in the last 3 years more on immigration), political studies, education, open data, data privacy, and social inclusion of different disadvantaged groups. The interviewee prefers not to mention the name of the CSO.

Recently, the organization becomes almost only project-based (with not so much money for operational grants) and the funds come from the Open Society Foundations, structural funds, funds dedicated to immigration studies and other European funds.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The interviewee stated that, to society level, there is a recent focus on data privacy, starting from the development of new surveillance technologies and the impact they have on citizens.

The organization has an interest in data privacy, surveillance perspective, and it runs two projects on data privacy, funded by their own funds and by other funding programs, but the organization is not a beneficiary of FP7 funds.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
As they were not involved in these types of projects, the question was not answered.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No, the CSO was not invited to participate in projects funded by FP7. Also, the CSO was not active involved/pro-active in this sense, even that the interviewee and the colleagues knew about this type of funding.

One reason was related to the CSO priorities: “we had our own projects and no time to investigate about this extensively.” Another reason, connected with the first one, is that the focus was more on national level, involvement in national policies regarding these topics and not so much on European level. The CSO uses and it is aware of the European policies, but it is not involved in drafting them.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
When speaking about the roles, based on the CSO expertise, the interviewee believes that its organization can be:
• Observer;
• Actor of research – research can be done so to create / develop the necessary standards that can assure the balance between public interest and protection of private life. The research would be on different levels: exploratory, standard development, extending the CSO research area;
• Programme evaluator;
• Influencer, in terms of drafting and submitting recommendations on different policies, to contribute with information, knowledge, experience from our country perspective on civil rights, data protection, surveillance.

The interviewee approached a bit the theme of who should make the first step and the opinion was that if they (the organization) would decide to get involved, they would have to be in touch with important people from other countries.

The specific fields of interest for the interviewee (and the organization) are: privacy, individual civil rights, peace, environmental risks, and minorities’ rights.

The interviewee expressed the interest in security research, from the perspective of getting a clear picture on which type of warranties are being offered for the civil rights protection, how and if abuses (that affect the human rights) are being made, how to find a balance between public interest and protection of private life.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
This discussion was more on the barriers that CSOs (and this particular CSO) are facing when it comes to involve in this type of funding.

First barrier/ need is related to more information available, more accessible information available, information on how CSOs can get involved was not accessible. The fact that the interviewee did not hear so much about this program means that it was not proper disseminated within the third sector, that important actors from the third sector (as the present CSO) was not consulted/its opinion was never asked.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee recommended two organizations, one of them being involved in an FP7 project and being specialized in data privacy. The other one was specialized in human rights defence and the interviewee believed that it was suited to be approached.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 44.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is involved in the direction of the Association for Technology and Internet - ApTI and is one of the founders. Mainly, the organization’s activity is distributed on three levels:

- Online activity;
- Open copyright;
- Internet governance.

In terms of main actions undertaken by the CSO, these are: advocacy, education, information. The organization works more with different collaborators, experts, depending on the nature of the projects the CSO is involved in.

The organization is project based, mainly, but has also its own initiatives (for example, the legislative initiative folder – informing the citizens on different legislative initiatives on national and European level, on topics of interest for the organization).

In terms of funding, the organization is both a beneficiary of national funds (for example, NGO Funds – EEA grants dedicated to the third sector), and of European funds (for example, FP7).

The CSO is a membership organization and has 16 members (individuals), representing different companies / other initiatives.

The CSO is part of different networks at national and European level:

- National Coalition on Open Data;
- Informal and formal collaboration with different national organizations;
- EDRI - European Digital Rights [https://edri.org](https://edri.org);
- IICANN At Large – European Regional At-Large Organization (EURALO) - The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is a nonprofit organization that is responsible for the coordination of maintenance and methodology of several databases of unique identifiers related to the namespaces of the Internet, and ensuring the network’s stable and secure operation [http://www.atlarge.icann.org](http://www.atlarge.icann.org);
- CSISAC – Civil Society Information Society Advisory Council (the voice of civil society at OECD ICCP) [http://csisac.org](http://csisac.org).

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization was and is still involved in three European projects:

- COMMUNIA ([www.communia-project.eu](http://www.communia-project.eu)) – a three year project funded by the European Commission within the eContentplus programme. The project was dedicated to theoretical analysis and strategic policy discussion of existing and emerging issues concerning the public domain in the digital environment - as well as related topics, including, but not
limited to, alternative forms of licensing for creative material; open access to scientific publications and research results; management of works whose authors are unknown (i.e. orphan works).

- **CONSENT** (www.consent.law.muni.cz) – a three year project that ended in April 2013, dedicated to consumer sentiment regarding privacy on user generated content services in the digital economy. The project tackled, in an indirect manner, security issues, being more dedicated to social networks and user generated content. The project was funded by FP7.

- **MAPPING** (www.mappingtheinternet.eu) – a four year project, with focus was on creating an all-round and “joined-up” understanding of the many and varied economic, social, legal and ethical aspects of the recent developments on the Internet, and their consequences for individuals and society at large. The project was funded by the FP7.

- The interviewee has also been part of advisory groups in other two European projects: **RESPECT** (http://respectproject.eu) and **SMART** (www.smartsurveillance.eu), being involved in what concerned security rules.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

First, the interviewee described in general terms the involvement in the above mentioned projects, in which the CSO was involved only as a partner.

In the MAPPING project, the CSO was the leader of WP4 – Policy Observatory (a link is provided by the interviewee: http://observatory.mappingtheinternet.eu

In the CONSENT project, the CSO was involved in all the projects steps and WP; it had the lead of the WP dedicated on how the consumers perceive social networks, with a focus on privacy (qualitative research).

The achievements that the CSO had, besides that it accomplished the objectives of the project, were in the new information and knowledge area (for the CSO). Also, the organization had the chance to share experiences and knowledge with other stakeholders, which represented a gain, as well.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

For now, the organization was involved only in the projects already mentioned.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The interviewee considers that his CSO represents an exception and that the big majority of NGOs is not participating, because their involvement is not encouraged, at least by the stakeholders from the security area. “CSOs usually are not invited, no matter how much a CSO would like to be
invited.” The interviewee’s CSO was taking part of the above projects as a consequence of the professional relations with the people that were developing the projects.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The interviewee’s CSO is already involved in this type of projects, having a proper network and expertise that allows it to be invited to take part in different consortiums / projects.

The barriers mentioned by the interviewee were: lack of funds / under-funding; lack or low skill in project writing (for this type of funding, not others).

Special calls / grants for CSOs represents a solution, from his perspective and also smaller and medium grants dedicated to CSOs / that can be accessed also by the CSOs.

Also, the interviewee suggested that a smaller or 0 co-funding can represent a solution to increase the involvement of CSOs in these projects.

The domains of interest for the CSO are: privacy, digital rights, surveillance. As roles, the organization can have an influence role, observer, and researcher (qualitative).

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee recommended us to contact an expert from a Bulgarian foundation.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; trans-CSO networking; project participation assessment; involvement in project execution.
Interviewee number 45.

0. Introduction
The organization is called Bundesnetzwerk Bürgerschaftliches Engagement – BBE and represents a national network for civil society in Germany. It is a nationwide network linking organizations and associations from the third sector (non-profit organizations) and civil society, from business and work life and federal and community institutions.

The network was founded by the National Council of the International Year of Volunteers (IYV 2001) on 5 June 2002. Meanwhile, it has 250 member organizations representing millions of citizens. The organization promotes civic involvement in all social areas and forms (e.g., in social work and health care, sports, cultural activities, environment, education and academics, politics and business). The funds come from three different sources: public funding, membership fees and project-based funding.

Exceptionally, two interviews were held with different representatives (#17 and #45) of the same organisation. They have not been integrated in the same template. Interviewers were different and emphasis is paid in different aspects.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has never been involved in research and security projects.

The reasons why it did not take part in projects funded by FP7 are:
- It is not affected / direct impacted by any problems related to security. Whatever issues appear, they deal with these issues within the network
- From the interviewee perspective, getting deeper into security related problems mean that they need to have profound technological knowledge and expertise, which is not the case for this network.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
Not the case.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No, it is not the case.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The organization would like to be involved in projects that concern human rights, migrants and everything related to these areas. As roles, they can be observers, influencers, disseminators.
5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
In order for CSOs to get access and to be more involved (and interested, in the first place) in security issues, it is needed of a more detailed explanation of the security concept. This way, the CSOs would identify with certain topics and will know which issues can be of interest for them, to be related with their activities.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
As already mentioned during the discussion, the interviewee did not have no one to recommend, as the members part of this were not directly involved in FP7 funded projects.

Keywords: priorities of security research.
Interviewee number 46.

0. Introduction
The organization is called Estonian Human Rights Center (EHRC) and is a non-profit organization that focuses on human rights, equality and diversity. It is an advocacy organization. The interviewee prefers not to mention the name of the CSO.

The interviewee is involved in the direction of the CSO and also teaches European Union law and studies public administration in doctoral level at Tallinn University of Technology (TUT). The interviewee manages the equal treatment advancement projects at TUT, a part of which is the campaign “Diversity Enriches”. The interviewee was involved with the youth organization Tegusad Eesti Noored (Active Estonian Youth) 2001 – 2008, being one of the founders and helping to manage it. The interviewee also took part in the work of the European Youth Parliament between 1999 and 2008.

The organization focus is on:
- Human rights – equal treatment, diversity, non discrimination;
- Asylum, refugees;
- Indirect: data protection and privacy.

The interviewee’s personal interest is on the impact of development of technologies on human rights.

The organization is being part of networks both at national and international level. At national level, the organization is being part of:
- Several platforms: on human rights, equal treatment;
- Human Rights Discussion Table (initiated by this CSO);
- Network of refugee associations;
- Network for Development cooperation;
- Network for Nonprofit organization (NENO);
- Open Government Partnership in Estonia.

At European and international level, the organization is very active and is being part of:
- ENAR – European Network against Racism;
- ECRE – European Council on Refugees and Exiles;
- ELENA –a network focused on asylum;
- JUSTITIA - a network dedicate on human rights and democracy;
- International Detention Coalition;
- European Union Fundamental Rights Platform;
1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization has been involved in European funded projects, funded by PROGRESS, the Refugee Fund, also FP7, developed in partnerships with universities, and not only from Estonia, but from abroad as well.

One big FP7-SSH project was ELDIA - European Language Diversity for All in partnership with the Academy of Finland (the consortium was bigger than that) on minority languages. For further information:  [www.eldia-project.org](http://www.eldia-project.org)

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The task of the Centre in ELDIA was to compile a legal analysis on the situation of Seto and Võro languages in Estonia. The involvement in this project has not brought too many achievements for the organization.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The interviewee has not looked at this type of funding, until now, although they are engaging in research as well. And for the moment the organization is not looking for this. The interest of the organization in the FP7/H2020 is big, but the direction that security research takes in Estonia is different from the direction of the organization’s mission.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee considers that in the future the organization should move its focus on how the new technologies have an impact on human rights. The organization would like to get involved in research activities on the impact of Biometrics in Border Control for migrants, issues concerning the Border Controls in general (irregular crossing, monitoring the borders, policing at borders), all these aspects in terms of human rights.

The organization would also like to conduct interviews in the Asylum area.

The willingness to involve in such projects will also increase if the project will come to support the CSO in its advocacy actions.

The CSO is opened to work with anyone, having previous collaborations with universities (the CSO grew out of the university), especially with TUT.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
From the CSO perspective, their lack of involvement in these projects comes from:

- Lack of necessary human resources;
- Not enough funds that can allow the CSO to involve; if they decide to make this investment in this area, they have to make sure that we have sufficient money;
- The intelligence and security community is much closed; is not very easy to get to a circle.

In the interviewee opinion, there are a lot of issues the FP7 /H2020 program should improve, in order to increase the willingness and ability of the CSOs to be involved. These kinds of projects are not too accessible for the CSOs in Estonia, in particular. The CSOs in Estonia are not so big, they work on project-based activities and because of this they are not too sustainable. “… we see this as a problematic area (the H2020 funding), rather than as an opportunity.”

People are not familiar with the FP7/H2020, except some universities. The CSOs are very reluctant to unknown issues, but this does not mean that some of the CSOs don’t have the knowledge and the expertise in this area.

What CSOs might lack is their capacity to manage big amount of money coming from these projects. Also, FP7 projects are not made ‘public’ to anyone interested in the topic, so the CSOs do not get invited to participate in these projects (lack of transparency). “The question is whether we can get real access to actual things behind.”

There is also a feature of the Estonian civil society, in the fact that it is very weak – the CSOs are underfunded and because of this they do not have the capacity and sustainability to work on a larger scale.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee did not give any suggestion at this point.

**Keywords:** intra-CSO capability; trans-CSO networking; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 47.

0. Introduction
The organization is called National Association for Large Families from Hungary and is the second biggest CSO in the country. Founded in 1987, the association works in the field of family and family right, especially the families with three or more children. At the present moment, the Association consists of over 11,000 families (more than 60,000 people).

The work of the association is done through 7 regional offices, with 12 full time staff and dozens of volunteers. The financing comes from membership fees, government funding and private donors (companies).

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The organization itself has not been involved in security research programs. But the interviewee used to work in the Hungarian Academia of Sciences and she had experiences in security and innovation related projects, as a researcher.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
As mentioned above, the interviewee organization was not involved within any project funded by FP7, but the interviewee shared her opinion, based on her work as a member of EESC and previous research experience.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The association was in projects funded by the EU, but coming through the Academia field and universities, so the association was not a direct partner.

Because it was not something related to our topic, these projects were not mentioned. The interviewee, as well, didn’t remember the name of these projects developed by the Academia, one she worked as a researcher.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee wanted to stress first why her organization is not involved (and why CSOs, in general) are not involved. The main reason why they are not involved is because the CSOs do not have the capacity for big scale projects. Sometimes, they are invited as partners only, because they have the “on the ground” expertise.

In terms of roles, the organization can play a role as observer in a project or expert (from the practitioner perspective) in a certain field, in this case, family rights. Depending on the topic of the
project, the association can also give policy recommendations in this field.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
CSOs need to feel connected and to identify themselves with security research issues. But in order to be so, they need to understand the big concept of security research and the fact that security concerns everybody, every individual and not just the higher ranks in the states.

In Hungary there has been developed a platform for Sustainable Development, where CSOs are encouraged to get involved and to explain their activity in front of the Parliament. This way, every part in the society gets to know the activities. This is a very good example of initiative that would be suitable at a bigger scale also, to encourage the participation of CSOs in FP7/H2020 projects.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
She recommended to get in touch with colleagues from the EESC, but did not have, at that time, a right person to recommend.

Keywords: inter-CSO networking.
0. Introduction

The organization is called Center for Community Organizing Middle Moravia and is a non-profit organization from Czech Republic that provides information and advisory services to representatives from public administration, civic organizations and businesses across the country. The interviewee is a member in ECOSOC and his focus is on public participation, partnership principle, and community development. The interviewee founded, next to other colleagues, the NGOs club in ECOSOC, dedicated to CSO representatives from the Committee.

Going back to the organization, its main focus is on:

- Citizen/NGOs participation in local and regional development. The organization designs and implements the public participation programs about planning and decision-making. For example, programs for citizen participation in planning and designing of public spaces, in housing estate revitalizations, in preparation of community development strategies or in investment planning. Within this program we organize public hearings, interactive exhibitions, implements sociological surveys and questionnaires, facilitates citizen advisory boards etc. CCO also conducts training seminars in the field of citizen participation for public administration.

- Local Sustainable Development. The organization provides consultation services for preparation of local social economic development projects with respect of sustainability principles. For example, we prepare and update local, micro-regional and regional development strategies; assist in preparation of local development projects and activities aimed at disadvantaged groups of citizens. The organization cooperates with local partners (public administration, businesses and NGOs) which enable us to tailor projects to local conditions.

- Regional Policy of European Union and Regional Development of the Czech Republic. Within this program the organization implements activities promoting principles of partnership and transparent decision-making in regional policy of European Union. In the Czech Republic we lobby for consultations and participation of public and non-profit organizations in preparation and implementation of EU regional policy instruments. The organization is actively involved in discussions about forms of regional policy, intermediates information for other non-profit organizations in the Czech Republic and prepares joint recommendations and strategies. We transfer our experience from the Czech Republic to other “new” as well as “old” EU member countries.

- Educating, supporting and strengthening of non-profit non-government organizations. The organization supports and educates members of civic and non-profit organizations on all levels. We work with volunteers; organize seminars and training workshops in order to
strengthen the non-profit sector. We promote interdisciplinary meetings and cooperation of non-profit organizations.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The interviewee answered no to this question. Actually, the interviewee was speaking more from his expert perspective and member of the EESC, and less from his position as director of the organization. The discussion was a general one, about the third sector involvement in different programs, what can be of interest more for the NGOs, in terms of funding, of course, with a focus on the security and or research.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research?
Are you satisfied with the results so far?
It is not the case.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
It is not the case. The interviewee mentioned one case with an agency the interviewee was in touch that worked on FP7, so to see if the organization could apply for this. Even that this was possible, so many things needed to be done, the process was too complicated, that the final decision was not to accept this, not to waste the time. “It is something you can try it, but it may be something that can make you waste the time”. The interviewee knows some NGOs that thought about it, but didn’t know to say if they applied. The CSOs see like this: FP7 is for universities.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee is not focused on this, but the interviewee wanted to share with us his opinion on the general situation. FP7 is a large resource, with many, many topics, but security is it something that is minority for a CSO. FP7 is a big, complicated program, from his point of view, is not so well known as structural funds. Usually the universities, as the interviewee sees it, are more informed or more motivated to use it. Also, agencies, bigger companies or more expert ones that apply have more personnel capacity.

CSOs usually, when they are looking to fulfill their mission, their goals, look for easy titles which can help them. For example, if they work on social inclusion, they will look at structural funds. But they don’t see FP7 as something to support them so much to fulfill their mission.

This type of project is complicated and unknown for the CSOs, compared to other projects. Universities and other agencies have more expertise and capacity. CSOs have different goals which they try to achieve and sometimes these have too little to do with security and/or research. CSOs are not all the time well-structured and they can’t reach all the information. For example, some processes are too complicated and time consuming, that is why CSOs prefer not to get involved.
Usually, because now is H2020, there are some experts that have worked with FP7 and they help the universities, the agencies to write these projects, but they are not focused on the CSOs. So, there is not enough information in the CSO sector, and they usually are afraid of resources they don’t know how to use, so they are not prepared to work with something they consider to be difficult.

From what the interviewee saw, regarding both FP7 and H2020, there are structures of people that are connected somehow with other structures. The interviewee heard that some former MEP are preparing agencies to offer support with applying to H2020, because they now that it is a complicated one and that they will be welcomed as a business.

A program like Europe for Citizens, which the NGOs understand, will be more accessed by them. Also, there is another program, the Capacity building in the Danube region strategy, which has a special call for the CSOs, for building their capacity, which helps them to achieve their mission, and there are expected several hundreds of applications.

So, this type of funding is understandable for the CSOs, which the CSOs see as something that can be used for their mission, for which they can apply. CSOs are not lazy to apply, but they have small chances to be successful. And, in the end, they will not be very positive regarding this, as so much energy will be wasted. And even if they know about this program, they see that from the CSO community nobody use it, or there are several CSOs that are using it. The interviewee considers that there a comparative analysis should be made between this and other programs dedicated to CSO) and see, for example, how the Europe for Citizens has so many applicants and why and FP7 had not have not so many? Maybe there are some mistakes, there are some steps which are missing.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
This kind of projects requires a lot of energy for the preparation (writing the project) and the NGOs lack the capacity of implementing such projects.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
A member at the EESC, former academia and involved in FP7 programs in Czech Republic. Presently, vice-president in a large umbrella organization in her country.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 49.

0. Introduction
The organization is called ActiveWatch: Monitoring Media Agency and is a human rights organization, from Romania, that militates for free communication for public interest.

The organization main areas of action (and areas of impact) are:

- Good governance, media education, freedom of expression, anti-discrimination. The organization is:
- Advancing open letters, reports and analysis to the European Commission; Getting involved in working groups to amend national legislation – for example, anti-corruption package of laws, environment legislation, Criminal and Civil Codes, security legislation, a.s.o.
- Assisting in writing and finalizing national legislation to ensure freedom of expression and access to information.
- Strengthening freedom of expression and press freedom, by: offering legal support and technical support to hundreds of journalists and editors and dozens of fast reactions in cases of infringement of freedom of speech; publishing the FreeEx Report annually, an in-depth analysis of the state of the Romanian press; publishing relevant studies on European and international freedom of expression law and access to public information in order to assist Romanian journalists, magistrates and attorneys in their work; organizing training courses and seminars with journalists, students, attorneys, judges, civil servants, managers of media; coordinating the Convention of Media Organizations, a coalition of professional associations, trade unions and media employers.
- Developing a secondary school curriculum and a ToT course on media education.
- Offering support to disadvantaged groups in Romania.
- Promoting citizens’ rights by: training journalists, NGOs and trade unions in methods of active intervention; measurement of the level of corruption in public administration in Romania; drafting anti-corruption guidelines for citizens; organizing coalitions and campaigns that aim to correct the performance of European Union funding (Structural Funds 112 Coalition; Transparency of EU funds in Romania, etc..) and the legislative process in Romania (Coalition for a Clean Parliament, Stop the Codes Campaign, etc.);

As of 2004, the organization is a member of the Reporters Without Borders network.

The organization’s main funding sources are: structural funds, EEA Grants (NGO Fund), media funds.

The organization is involved in a series of formal and informal partnership at national and European level.
1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The interviewee said that the organization was not part of any of this type of projects.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
It is not the case.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No. But the interviewee thinks that this interview represents a good occasion to be pro-active and explore the opportunities that H2020 brings and partner with other organizations (for the beginning, one of its current partners from other projects).

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee believes that the organization can be a partner (not a manager/as in the consortium leader) in such projects.
In terms of roles, the interviewee sees the organizations as an influencer (based on their heavy expertise in the domains mentioned above) and researcher. The areas of interest, that the organization can and would be willing to involve into are: fight crime (from the investigative journalism perspective), illegal trafficking, ensure privacy and freedom.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
The organization has a broad expertise in managing EU funded projects, but not funded by FP7, and the interviewee considers that the organization still has not the experience in being the leader of such projects. So, gaining more experience in this area (being involved in projects funded by H2020) will increase their willingness to get involved.
Also, the co-funding represents a big problem (usually for the third sector) and maybe a lower participation will increase, as well, the capacity to take part to such projects.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee recommended one of the persons that were already interviewed (an organization with experience in FP7 funded projects) and a colleague from the Romanian Center for Investigative Journalism (Stefan Candea, president).

Keywords: priorities of security research.
Interviewee number 50.

0. Introduction
The organization is called Legal Center for the Protection of Human Rights and the Environment of Slovenia and is a not for profit organization from Slovenia and is a legal information center for CSOs (one of the 3 organizations specialized in this from the country).

The organization was founded in 1998 and the interviewee is involved for 10 years, in the last 5 being also the director of the organization. The organization team is formed of lawyers and sociologist.

The organization is active in three main areas:
- Migration, international protection and refugees (protection of asylum seekers, migrants, refugees)
- Discrimination (i.e., fight against discrimination, gender equality, protection of vulnerable groups)
- Environment (effective legal protection of the environment, legal protection of sustainable and inclusive spatial management)

The organization’s main actions are: offering legal assistance, consultancy, study reports, advocacy, informing, training for NGOs, encouraging civil dialogue, national and international projects, and involvement in policy-making and decision-making processes.

Network wise, the organization is being part of different networks at national and European networks, but this didn’t bring too much partnership for the CSO.

The interviewee told us that they prepare research and studies for the European Migration Network (practical measures that the country is adopting with regard to migration, asylum, etc. in order to prevent irregular migration to Slovenia, visa policy that Slovenia is adopting).

The interviewee mentioned also being a partner of UNHCR – UN Refugee Agency (the regional representation in Budapest) and the EU network on justice and environment. The CSO is member of EASO (European Asylum Support Office) and is part of the network of NGOs on migration and asylum issues on the Balkans.

The CSO conducts their own researches, but also are commissioned by other bodies to conduct different research, expertise or analysis (e.g., how extradition of foreigners/aliens is conducted in Slovenia).

Main funding sources: European Social Fund (for the environment actions), European Refugee Fund, European Return Fund.
1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The interviewee has not been involved for the moment in European security or research.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
Because the interviewee has not been involved in any project, the interviewee has no opinion about their experience.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The interviewee has not been involved in any activity or project related with FP7/H2020 outside security research or in research in general.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
NGOs normally do not want to play a passive role, they want to have an active role, they want to improve the situation in the country / area / region where they are working. It is the case for their organization. Very important is having always the capacity to influence, to improve the application of standard for human rights protection in different procedures.

They are very interested in being part of this program and they definitely would like to have the position of somebody that can influence, but also conduct researches.

But, what the interviewee learned in recent years is that applying for big funds represents a very long way and normally there is this lack of information, contact points that makes the process hard.

What has proven, for their country, to be functional was to have national contact points, of delegated bodies that can refer you to particular programs, which can shorten the path.

This represents one of the great obstacles (lack of contact points / delegated bodies) and this can be one of the solutions, to be in charge for Slovenian CSOs.

The interviewee agrees that is very different if a big network asks the organization to be a partner and if the organization is asking / inviting other organizations to be a partner.

So, in terms of obstacles for the CSOs:
- how large / small is the organization is;
- co-funding (which is something valid for the entire sector from the country);
- lack of information.
In terms of areas of interest, they would involve on what is connected to migration, refugees, asylum, border monitoring, environment (legal aspects).

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
What was mentioned above regarding the contact point / more information focused on CSOs and also having a support when they apply for.

On a wish list, the interviewee mentioned that she would put being part of a program/network - this is something that will ease the access to such projects.

Also, gaining more experience in research would be on the organization wish list. Having this part stronger, would increase their willingness to participate / to get involved.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
The interviewee did not know to recommend other organizations.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability.
Interviewee number 51.

0. Introduction
The interviewee is member of Cyber Security Austria- Plötzlich Blackout (Suddenly Blackout) project since 2013, devoted to the advancement of the security strategic infrastructure of Austria. The interviewee is also one of the initiators of the Systemic Foresight Institute. The financial supporter of the project was the Austrian security research programme KIRAS. (National Research Development Programme KIRAS Austria). The interviewee has experience in the cyber area because the interviewee worked for a CSO (2010) “Cyber Security Initiative Austria”. Here also the issue of systemic risk was raised.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The interviewee stated that for them it was of high importance to get involved and to look at the topic “blackout”, not only in theory but also in practice. The personal motivation of interviewee was that they had already some experience and wanted to pass this knowledge. In research, it often happens that only single aspects are taken into account due to the lack of resources. Due to organizational reasons research topics and results are limited. Therefore, this project allowed the interviewee to look at the topic entirely.

At the moment the interviewee is working for the project “Plötzlich Blackout”. But the interviewee would like to focus more on the topic “solutions for the design of the energy system.” The energy system needs to be secured to interference. That means to address the risk that occurs and raise awareness because of the massive network of the infrastructure.

The interviewee also addressed the communication in case of emergencies like the terror attacks in France. In the opinion of the interviewee the communication by the politicians was wrong. Firstly you need to prevent attacks of course, but according to our value system. And secondly you need to tell people clearly: not anything can be prevented and people need to prepare for those cases. Terrorism always acts on two levels: First: The attack, the direct event and second: which is far worse: how people and politicians react and how they handle it.

It is very tragic that people have been killed, but it would have been even worse if these events were not directed against individuals, but against the infrastructure. If the infrastructure, and in particular the voltage infrastructure would have been attacked, you could with very little effort not only kill a few people, but to achieve sustainable disaster, which would affects many more people. And this lack of awareness is a problem.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The theme has arrived at the facilities, at least in Austria and something is changing. It is surprising
how little people and companies (also on an international level) are not yet considered the infrastructural failures that are associated with it.

The interviewee was firstly confronted with prejudice, especially with the concern that people would panic, if they were informed about a possible blackout. This is one of the main problems, the interviewees sees, that the government believes citizens would panic if they know the truth about special risk that exists in society. But as some researcher found out (from Switzerland) people do not panic as long as they have the information, especially when they get the information right on time.

Therefore, the interviewee points out that the integrated security communication is an important point. Create awareness that we are not as safe as we think we are. The fact that we actually have a lot more to focus on: individual responsibility, starting with preparatory measures.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

In the first part of the FP7 the interviewee was indirectly involved due to his studies - the CADS Project. It was about disaster research and the integration of "first responder". At the moment the interviewee tries to become part as an expert in different projects. More on a national level and to get into H2020- Due to the fact that one person alone cannot provide a whole project. But so far nothing concrete has emerged.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

For the interviewee, it is the main goal to be consulted and to participate. But therefore a financial cover is needed; also the interviewee is willing to pass his knowledge further. At the moment the interviewee is also teaching and is part of a research project, which is soon running out to pay for living. But still the interviewee is highly motivated to be involved.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The interviewee stated that funding is a problem as well as bureaucracy. A wish would be that an organization, probably an umbrella organization is established, which supports and helps with the overhead (funding, calls, bureaucracy) and that is possible for the CSOs to concentrate on their know-how and how it is useful for the project.

"As a CSO you have little to do with the bureaucratic overhead but the knowledge how to handle it is needed. We cannot expect people working as volunteers to provide this as well. But this means that those organizations with the needed resource get the money, and not those providing the expertise.

When an input is given it should be rewarded. This of course is done out of interest, but you should see that your work is honoured. Without support CSOs cannot participate and pass their
knowledge. Also often other stakeholder do not trust CSOs because they do not know how the
generated their expertise.”

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed? Are you aware of other CSOs
which could be relevant for us?
Cyber Security Austria

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme
framework.
0. Introduction
The project „ForschungsWende“ (Research Turn) is part of the “Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler” (Association of German Scientists). One the one hand “ForschungsWende” tries to organize CSOs for other partners (example BMBF Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung/German Ministry of Education and Research), on the other hand the CSO helps others CSOs to get involved into research projects and to generate knowledge. The CSO is working with social unions, environmental unions to bring the topic of research politics and research agendas, like the one of H2020 closer to them. The project tries to find out: where can CSOs get involved into research programs? How can they be involved? The project tries to support the CSOs with regard to content, when they are involved in a process. Although, the organization does not work exactly in the security field, they work in H2020 where security policies are part of the agenda, especially security and communication as one of the main columns.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
Because the CSO is a nationally organization they have not been involved on European level yet. But in Germany there are now increasingly participatory processes, for example in the energy or urban development fields - these are currently the main fields, also in which the CSO is working. In security policy and security research fields the CSO has not been included until now.

But still there are interesting projects where the CSO participated. There was one project by the “Fraunhofer Institute” (involved in research processes), which raised a topic concerning the security and communication field. They were concerned with Big Data and Internet systems, which was a major issue throughout the research. But then it became clear to the interviewee that there is no systematic impulse, how social institutions are included in the discourse at all. The CSO is a partner in the project Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI), which tries to develop "Tools" and further how can those be put into practice and then become part of the research agenda setting processes or research programmes. There the CSO provided expertise. The reason why the CSO was part of the “RRI Tools” (Responsible Research and Innovation) was because public engagement is an essential pillar of the project and it tries to find out how the public engagement can be organized, to which level and with whom.

To provide information ForschungsWende organizes workshops for example in the Energy field, representing research strategies, develops fact sheets with topics like - what strategies exist? How do they work? What research focus do they have? The organization tries to strengthen the critical capacity of organizations to help them to realize where there are matters to determine research orientations or research topics? Quasi helping them to find the "blind spots" of existing research agendas. This is the main role of the CSO: to look from a different angle at research strategies (the view of society) and in the best case be a complementary perspective to the embossed economic
 science system, which currently frame the research programs. Normally the CSO gets a requested from associations/unions, who are invited to specific research questions, to brief them. It also happens that the BMBF (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung) is requesting the CSO, if they can organize participants for setting their agenda. But sometimes it is difficult for other CSOs to get involved because especially with multi-year processes, energy transition or a project like “Plattform Zukunftsstadt” (Platform Future City), the CSOs have no time frame and resources to provide the capacity. So you have to find someone (Organizations/CSOs) and persuade those CSOs.

To get involved in the different project the CSO used one’s own initiative as well as the CSO has been asked by others.

The interviewee was an expert in several projects and also was part of several hearings concerning CONSIDER (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance) and Engage 2020. The motivation was, that the interviewee considers it quite smart of the EU to generate expertise, which will be used in FP 8- therefore the calls can be more specific.

The CSO sees its role more in stakeholder dialogs as well as being an expert.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The CSO is not satisfied with the ongoing process. The interviewee claims, that they were involved for other civil society organization in the agenda-setting processes, but after sharing the information it was not clear what happened to their made recommendations and if the partners who asked for it really used them.

The interviewee notes that there are very opaque processes where the CSOs sit on the shorter lever, because CSOs do not have a lobby on the administrative level. Here the established sciences and the economy have an advantage over the CSOs. Also, the interviewee observed that results given by CSOs are withdrawn due to political pressure.

The interviewee further sees other problems, for example it is still a very unusual claim to science, to share interpretational sovereignty with CSOs, because they have not done this in the past 100 years. The interviewee mentioned that everyone still is part of this process and that it will still need a lot of time, till CSOs will become equal partners concerning research. Still, the mutual acceptance and mutual understanding is missing. For science it is often not clear what they can do with the civil society partners /want /need. They are forced by politics but it is not much fun for them.

But still there has been achieved something: It has been achieved that the higher participation of CSOs concerning the agenda setting process
as well as the “programme process” is part of the coalition agreement (in Germany). So it has arrived on a political level – this is already a great success. But in the opinion of the interviewee the design is still missing. With H2O2O and the RRI (Responsible Research and Innovation) approach they are moving in the right direction but still it will be a fail and error process. Looking at CONSIDER (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance) you need to say we are still at the beginning. Not so many CSOs are involved in the project of CONSIDER (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance) and if they are, the CSOs are really scientific ones.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Partner at “RRI Tool” (Responsible Research and Innovation) and at other projects experts for example Engage 2020 and “CONSIDER” (Civil Society Organisations in Designing Research Governance).

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee has the opinion that CSOs firstly need to understand the subject of science and research. This includes in the opinion of the CSO, a start financing by the state supporting and investing in staff positions, because until now a lot of CSOs do not have the know-how to get involved. As long as that does not happen and also associations/CSOs understand that research is a major concern, for example dealing with social policy concerns or for environmental concerns, nothing will change and the parties cannot talk in equal manners.

That is one of the main things: the need for more capacity and resources in organizations to build up the subject. The interviewee is convinced if organizations have realized that being part in research projects is an opportunity to get involved into research and Innovation policy. In order to this, this means resources need to be released. That means we need a platform on which CSOs can be cross-linked with other CSOs. This also means that topics are provided and information is shared, so that it is possible to write papers and agendas. Concerning for example how does a sustainable security policy look like or how a sustainable energy policy.

Follow-up question concerning the role of the CSOs in the process:

The interviewee is satisfied with their role, to provide service and being a coordinator. But the interviewee would like to extend the work of the CSO- At the moment only two people are working for the project. Therefore, it is impossible for the CSO to work efficiency - they need more resources, more staff and material to have the possibility to widen their network.

The interviewee would be interested to be part of security issues like high-tech strategy or communication security, because it is topic of a societal importance, but the resources are missing.
5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
Resource! Money! Staff! The interviewee sees so many calls where the interviewee thinks, it would be great to participate but ForschungsWende has no resources to write the papers.

At the moment the communication between the national organizations and the CSOs is not working well. In Austria for example the network between the national bodies and civil society is well established. They have, for example, a service point for civil society organizations.

An option would be to create a handout or factsheet reminding researchers to take CSOs specifically into account. Also a service point could be a good idea, which helps CSOs writing papers or applicants.

Wish –List
The intuition of the research administration, that CSOs have certain needs, meaning that well-established instruments do not please the needs of CSOs. Where do CSOs need support? Financially? And where do they need special support by national institutions. But also to scour where have CSOs disadvantaged: in the present research proposals, research programs or agenda processes? Accepting and get sensitive for the point, that CSOs are no science experts, but bring in important life expertise.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
- German Watch. The interviewee stated that the interviewee knows a lot of CSOs, which would be interested in participating, but they cannot due to the lack of resources.
- At the moment a lot of CSOs are overwhelmed by the offers of participation, therefore they would not participate voluntarily in other projects. Is likely that always the same CSOs are addressed and other are not involved at all.
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Interviewee number 53.

0. Introduction
The Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer – FPH was founded 2002 in France, which looks in a critical way on research and innovation processes (international, national and local) but also tries to provide advices and ideas how to make processes different. Especially sustainability plays a huge role for the CSO. They have three main topics:

1. Academic research is nowadays done in private and public laboratories but since some years also CSOs need to be taken into account, because they have their own needs and claims. Nowadays you have to take CSOs serious in research.
2. How you deal with the fact that there are no consents in research about the main topics concerning important issues. So the CSO tries to find a way, how to deal with it. Here also whistle blowers are taken into account.
3. Due to the fact that participatory research methods exist, the CSO tries to spread them and give advices.

The CSO works closely with other stakeholders, like other CSOs, politicians, the EU-Parliament, researcher and academics.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The CSO has not been involved in a security project yet. They have been part of projects by the European Commission (FP6 and FP7).

The motivation of being part of one of the projects was, because it was specific about engagement and participatory research (how it works, and why it is useful). It was a call especially for CSOs, and the interviewed CSO was the project leader.

Also, they were invited to be part of two other projects, one concerning the environment and the other Living Knowledge (PERARES (Public Engagement with Research And Research Engagement with Society)) and as well CRÉPE (Cooperative Research on Environmental Problems in Europe). The interviewee stated that it was of high importance that they were involved in other projects and therefore, were asked by others to become part of other projects as well.

The motivation of the CSO was that it was possible to set participatory research on the agenda not only in research also on the political side. To inform stakeholders which tools are used, in which form they are useful in research and which are the sustainable effect.

The CSO had different roles in the different projects. As mentioned before they once were the project leader, in other projects they were partners.

The interviewee said, that although they are not exactly working in the security field, some research topics of the organization are close to the security area. They are working in the
environment and health sector and also to the risks concerning those topics. The CSO does not have an extra field where they are directly working in; it is more that they try to explore the structure of research nowadays. That’s why they are involved in different areas.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewee is not satisfied with the results so far. Since 25 years participatory research is done, but still it is quite marginal. It is only present in little sectors and not always integrated in the big sectors as a method. Everyone is talking about the method of participatory research but not everyone is using it.

Something of course has been done, especially under FP6 and FP7 - a lot of material now exists but it is not used. You can see that some projects are asking questions, which had been answered before in other projects. For example research now knows enough about participatory research, but still there is research done about it, what is more needed are concepts about how to establish networks and research institutes.

The interviewee has still the impression that something has been achieved. Small CSOs had the possibility to get some funding and were able to organize workshops. An exchange was possible that researchers listen to the CSOs and they had the impression that they have been heard.

Concerning the impact, the interviewee has the opinion others were inspired by the ideas of the CSO. It also affected the research agenda. For example in H2020 one of the pillars is science with and for society – this is due to a lot of NGOs but also parliamentarians.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
Been part of CRÊPE (Cooperative Research on Environmental Problems in Europe) Other the interviewee did not remember.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
To be ideally involved, it would be a start if CSOs would be part of the discussion of budgetary matters. When you look at H2020 a lot of the money goes to industrial leadership – but it can be seen quite problematic that such a programme gives so much money to the private industry. It was the wish of the CSO to spent more money (like 10 billion) on other pillars. The interviewee stated that the interviewee is not exactly against industrial research but the question is, which industry you support. It is important to look at a topic as a whole and to find out where it makes sense to start with research and the need to have a connection between civil society and it needs. It would be nice if some of the bodies would listen more carefully and if topics, which should be put on the agenda are firstly discussed with society.

It would be nice if an NGO body would be established, which would be responsible for different
sectors. Stating what kind of research is needed in this sector. A knowledge based society should be taken seriously. It should be taken into account that there is a lot of knowledge in society, and that not only researchers, industry and expert have this knowledge, therefore they need to be part of the process.

If the CSO could be part of security research they would favour the energy area /risk and here the question of nuclear power or other power systems, which are less dangerous. And also they would be interested in the question of secured society and the right of individuals and the collective. What needs to be answered; what creates security, humans or machines?

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The interviewee stated that an easy funding scheme would increase the willingness. What are mechanisms, making it easier for CSOs to find researchers to work with. But also the other way round: how can researcher find CSOs.

The interviewee sees different barriers for CSOs: the financial base, they need to decide to set priorities and have to cube with their capacity. And because they are active in so different areas, research is often not the first topic to think of. They also have to internalize the idea of being part of research questions.

Another point is, that of course for researcher it is sometimes hard to work with a CSO, which provides knowledge, because the expert/researcher probably questions it owns capacities with this. Science then is no more an area of “excellence”.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

- Nuclear transparency watch.

Keywords: priorities of security research; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 54.

0. Introduction
Johanniter Unfallhilfe e.v. is a big German organization, which refers to itself as a NGO. The interviewee however refers to the CSO as a Non-Profit-Organization. The areas were the Johanniter get involved are various: engaged in the social area like first aid training, rescue service, rescue helicopters as well in emergency management, but also they provide kindergartens, programmes for young people as well as care options for elderly people (to name only a few). They are a CSO, because although they have 15000 staff members they have more than 30000 people working for them voluntarily and have 1.3 million sponsors in Germany.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The Johanniter were involved in the FP 7 project Geo – Pictures. This project was part of the space line by FP 7 and dealt with real-time information and pictures to improve the decision making process in international disasters (for example Haiti, Philippines).

The task done by the Johanniter in the project was to be one of the practice partners/end-user. They did part of the field research as well as provided a lot of practical experience to develop the technology. The reason for the CSO to get involved was that they are interested in this topic.

The CSO had the chance to get involved due to the fact that the CSO is one of the biggest disaster protection management organizations in Germany and they are also connected with the European network “Union civil protection mechanism” therefore, the organization is quite known and well-established.

But the Organization is also engaged in other projects. At the moment they are part in a project by the ESA (European Space Agency), which deals with the topic of urban disaster risk reduction. The Johanniter are also involved in the H2020 (space sector) Project Geo-Vision.

In most of the projects the CSO has the role of the end-user with the focus on civilian disaster protection, most of the time a second end-user is present, which is most of the time a person from the United Nations.

The security fields where the CSO is active is disaster risk management (to optimize communication in such situations)

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewee is very satisfied with the process so far. Through the work a higher practical orientation has been achieved. It is important that research is user driven, like it is done in H2020.
For the Johanniter it is an important goal to always have a result, which is practical or at least brings the security research further. This is also one of the main motivations for the interviewee to continue being part in research.

To give an example of the impact of the organization the interviewee said that in Geo-Pictures it was due to the Johanniter that the application is now really easy to use in the field and that they can use a smart phone application to use it.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The Johanniter joined in, in different calls for the FP7 and the H2020 (not only space) but the applications were not all successful. They put effort (time and manpower) in the application but this is a normal process like the interviewee stated that only 10% of the calls are successful.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
Ideally they would like to be part of theme-based networks, because this is an ideal exchange. Also, the CSO is invited to give their response to other projects of the FP 7 and H2020 (advisory board or expert). Those activities can be performed by the Johanniter at the moment and they are quite satisfied with it.

Also, the CSO already has different roles in different projects they applied for the BMBF (Ministerium für Bildung und Forschung/German Ministry of Education and Research) “Fit für Europa” (fit for Europe). At the moment they are working on their own project proposal to establish a national network with the topic extreme weather response for a call by H2020 2015.

The interviewee was also asked to the multiple roles CSOs have to take (like in society, helping and research) and what thinks about it. The interviewee said that it is really important, especially in the international exchange, because each CSO learns from the other, for example in disaster risk reduction and prevention and to optimize this in national and international levels. Therefore, the interviewee sees a benefit for the Johanniter to have a better network and a better know-how.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
One of the limits is the manpower. The team of the interviewee has 4 staff members, hence to this time is also limited, and of course the question of funding. Comparing the willingness to be part of FP 7 and H2020, H2020 has the advantage that a 100% refunding for CSOs is possible and not only part of it, how it was in FP7. Thereby H2020 has a financial advantage because money is also often a limitation. Maybe it will be easier now. Another barrier of getting involved is the administrative effort, because it is quite difficult.
Wish-List:
- Better networking;
- To have a bigger choice between different projects;
- To have the possibility to be part of projects which are also useful for the CSO.

For the interviewee it is important that as much CSOs as possible are involved in the research process, but the interviewee also is aware of the fact that for little CSOs it is much harder and difficult to be a project leader, but of course they are a perfect provided of expert knowledge.

Another problem the interviewee sees is that a lot of CSOs are not aware of the fact that they could get involved in research projects. As well as researchers do not know which CSO exists. In Germany the BMBF tries to bring CSOs together but on a European level this is totally missing.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
- Joahnniter Austria

Keywords: inter-CSO capability; trans-CSO networking; Involvement in project execution; friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 55.

0. Introduction

Involve was set up 10 years ago. It was established because the members of the CSO felt that there is a real need for re-imaging the relationship between large institutions and the people that they serve. At the moment you can observe institutions, which are designed for a mass-industrial society, which are struggling with a new society, a post-industrial society or network society, depending on which phrase you prefer. And also the citizens inhabit have different expectations to society. They are less willing to accept the old way of making decisions and also it is a situation where the government finds itself more and more powerless - finds itself unable to deal with complex issues- the solutions need to be co-created. This is the background why Involve was founded, to proof practices and manly with a base in the UK. Also the work focuses on the UK the interviewee stated that UK is not working independently, it has to interact with people in Europe and the EU, and therefore the European aspects are taken into account.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The organization is currently working on Engage 2020, a project, which is looking at social engagement in research. The CSO looks at the process concerning research and engagement of society actors. This is not only concerning people of the public, but also CSOs and interest groups for example. Therefore, the focus of the organization is on engagement of social groups and not particular on security. The organization is involved for more than 1½ years, and will be part of the project for another year. The CSO was invited into the project by the lead of technology because the CSO does a lot of work around participation in the UK. Therefore they were asked to provide their knowledge and experience.

At the moment the CSO is also involved in another EU-Project: Involve is part of the second round of the European Citizen Consultation. This project does not concern science and technology as such, but it is a project that at least brings in some knowledge of engagement into European issues.

The CSO was involved in the UK Sciencewise (British government: science dialogue expert resource centre), which explores how to engage the public in scientific issues. It is already running for 10 years. This project also touches some security issues. For example there was a project concerning a DNA – Database. The interviewee stated that the CSO was involved in it. Involved was also a citizens jury and the project also tried to include those people, who were most affected by it.

The interviewee was also involved in a project by Sciencewise which dealt with the question of open data, which risk are excising, how much open data should people provide, which by the understanding of the interviewee touches security issues.
Concerning FP7 the interviewee stated: For the CSO it does not make a difference if the project is part of FP7 or for example H2020. But this form of funding provides enough income to do the projects. Not every funding programme is useful in this regard- but this was not the key motivation for the CSO. The project allowed them to explore some of the key issues to them, which are around societal engagement and the role of citizens in science and technology, the assessment of the role of citizens in setting the research agenda. That are the reasons why INVOLVE decided to be part of the project.

The main role of the CSO is: to provide a lot of the research. Therefore, it was possible to look at different things like citizens shops for example (for the first time).

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The interviewee is not fully satisfied with the results so far. There has been a good effort, also you can see the projects as good pilots and really some good work has been done, getting project happening and making them larger and more and more ambitious, but it is still not a high frequently activity. Those activities still happen on the side, on top of existing works and in this regard it becomes a “nice to have” but often it happens too late or too infrequently in order to have a real impact. This needs to be change; engagement needs to become more mainstream. But the interviewee is also happy to see that the rate of experimentation is opening up and that it is possible to see that organizations are also opening up, which was not expected- That is really positive – but there is always the risk that you go back to the deficit model. The question for institutions is always: Why are we doing engagement? Is it because you get better science results; is it because it is a democratic right or is it because we think it will help us to cell technologies better to the public?

Also the interviewee has the opinion that a lot needs to be changed; some interesting results came out of engagement. For example the citizens science project were you can observe huge amounts of data processing and input, which would not have happened without the involvement of citizens. Looking at Sciencewise you can see that project/programmes, which were considered by the government, had been taking down by the involvement of citizens. Because citizens thought that it is waste of money and a bad idea - also there are cases were the government was really in favour of certain technologies. But it also happens the other way round. For example gene therapy - the government believed that the public is not in favour of those ideas, but while talking to the public, they found out, that only a small group of people have an extreme opinion on it, and talking to a lot of people made clear that there is support by most of the people for this kind of technologies. And therefore, it was possible for the government to get more focused on the project and offensive.

That means that engagement can work but it does not always has to work. This means that engagement is often done in a way where it does not maxims the impact it could have.
3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
The Engage 2020 cuts across all of them so the CSO has been part of the projects.

Involve was part of those project due to pre-exciting contacts. The interviewee mentioned that without those relationships they would not have had the possibilities to be part of the projects, because normally trust is a problem.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
The interviewee has the opinion that especially in the security area something needs to be done. Openness for them is very difficult. Although they want to be open and they should be open. Engagement is hard when probably not everything is possible to be named. Because it is hard to have meaningful involvement with CSOs if every second question is answered by “I cannot tell you this”. Often it happens that companies or other institutions asked for involvement or engagement at the last minute and then often it is too late.

In the UK, drones are an important topic- Sciencewise would like to have a dialogue with society about drones but to have this dialogue a policy maker needs to be willing to talk to them. The role of this policy maker should be in consequent, if society wants to change something, the policy maker would need to change decisions, which were made, and show, at least, the willingness to change something, if society wants something to be changed. Problem holders are afraid of the answer and often they asked far too late. Therefore, the wish would be, that people come earlier to CSOs like INVOLVE and Sciencewise whereby reaction of society opinion could be taken into account.

The interviewee would like to be an expert adviser on methodology. Topics are health and environment but the interviewee is willing to work in all fields.

Due to participation the interviewee hopes to see more projects were CSOs are involved.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
Awareness of opportunities! When do these options arise? Possibilities to understand the broader aspects of research. Also, the willingness to understand, first, the context of your own country, and second the European context, because this is a confusing one. A related problem to this is that the EU has its own language, which takes time to learn. Sometimes people are not willing to learn the language. So there are a lot of groups, which could be part of projects, but it is not put into language people understand.

Also there are problems related to resources: finding the time to take part; and the capacity. But
the interviewee also sees a problem that most of the NGOs work on a national level, and it is hard for them to keep track on this alone, without getting involved in a European project.

*Question of umbrella organization and if they probably could be better involved:* The interviewee thinks yes but is quite sceptical, because the interviewee doubts that those umbrella organizations can represent the member interest (all the CSOs in a national level). Each umbrella organization in Brussels will develop its own agendas and interests.

**Wish – List:**

- Hard to understand the European context, therefore, European organizations need to become better in the fact to tie into the national structure
- Stated that a lot of conversations about topics, like drones, resilience are done on national level by different groups. Therefore, it would be interesting to go to these groups together and form a European dialogue.
- Mentioned the problem of the lack of resources of the CSOs and the problem to get involved on an international base
- Also that CSOs focus more on the national level because this is hard enough

**6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?**

- AccessEurope based in Spain (freedom of information)
- Board Member of Involve: consultant that worked with security agency.

**Keywords:** inter-CSO capability, trans-CSO networking.
Interviewee number 56.

0. Introduction
The interviewees (x2) work for a CSO of 30 employees (the interviewee prefers not to identify the CSO) located in the UK that specialises in supporting black and ethnic minority young people. It provides educational opportunities, as well as advising on criminal justice policies. The CSO is well known in the UK because it was set up in response to a tragic event in the UK and has campaigned for better treatment for black and ethnic minorities by the police and criminal justice system.

The interviewee explained that the organisation is not-for-profit—it’s a charitable trust. The organisation has also established a consultancy company. The profit from the consultancy feeds back into the CSO.

This case illustrates the benefits of particular CSOs to EU-funded security research. This is a well-known CSO, led by individuals who are an inspiration for many people in the UK—not only black and ethnic minorities. The CSO also has strong links with a broad range of organisations including the police and local community.

The CSO clearly benefited from participation in EU-funded research, due in part to the positive experiences of working with consortium partners.

1. Has you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The CSO is involved in an EU-funded security project on urban crime and security. It is a partner organisation.

In the past, the CSO worked together with a consultancy firm. The consultancy contacted the CSO about participating in the EU-funded project. The CSO was invited to participate as a partner due to its high profile, good reputation and its location in London. It was the only CSO in the consortium. The others were businesses.

The CSO is very well connected in its local community, said the interviewees. They also work closely with stakeholders, such as the police and local authorities. The relationship between the CSO and the police is particularly strong. The organisation does identify with the term “CSO”, and refers primarily to “grass-roots” organisations and community-led organisations.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewees expressed satisfaction with the project. The CSO was able to gain an understanding of security issues from a EU perspective.
In return, the project was given access to the CSO’s “unique perspective”. The CSO provided knowledge and insight into local problems, and has good links with key stakeholders groups, including police and community organisations. The CSO was able to “say how things are ‘on the ground’”.

The CSO was able to feed into the project. CSO staff conducted the research. They were able to focus on community issues in the local area, and produced case studies. The topics covered were relevant to local communities. The interviewees said that addressing some other security issues (e.g. terrorism) would have been harder. The consortium partners were considered “open and honest”. In their opinion, the findings from their research were incorporated into the project. The CSO also gave input in relation to the technological outputs from the project. They gave feedback and helped evaluate the usefulness of the technological solution. According to the interviewees, the technology resulting from the project was “usable”.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?
No. The organisation is more locally focused.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?
Not applicable.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?
Not applicable. The organisation is not going to participate in another EU-funded security project in the short term. This is because it wants to focus on its core objectives. They have other priorities, such as youth engagement at a local and national level. They have strategic objectives and these are not focused on safety and security. The CSO cannot “spread itself too thinly”.

However, the interviewees said that “added value” is provided from engagement with local communities as part of a EU project.

The interviewees pointed out that they work for a well-established charity. It is therefore possible to participate in EU projects. This is not the case in relation to other CSOs.

In London, there are hundreds of grass-roots community organisations. These CSOs are small and their resources are stretched. They would need to see a real benefit to participation in a EU project. Small CSOs would also need support.

The interviewees admitted that they found conducting research for the EU project “intensive”. They had perhaps underestimated how time consuming it would take. For instance, it took some
time, for instance, to access data for the research.

Unfortunately, the CSO employed a researcher three days a week—it should ideally have employed someone full time.

The local authority had to provide access to data and the bureaucracy caused delays. In addition, organisations had to be chased—which was time consuming. The CSO would have benefited from more formal links to the local authorities from the project outset. The interviewees believe that the research would have been beyond the capacity of smaller CSOs.

The project was very “hard work”, and it was CSO’s first experience of a project of this scale.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?
Not applicable.

Keywords: intra-CSO capability; trans-CSO networking; project participation assessment.
Interviewee number 57.

0. Introduction

The interviewee is working for a medium-sized think tank CSO (around 25 employees, including part time staff. It has “interns” rather than “volunteers”). The CSO is located in the UK. Historically, the CSO has undertaken work in relation to a range of social issues. Over the last few years, however, it has developed expertise and work in the field of countering extremism. When the interviewee joined the CSO, s/he addressed issues related to integration and diversity. S/he is currently focusing on extremism that links to violence.

The interviewee explained that the CSO is involved in two activities: a) research and b) action delivery. The latter, which focuses on developing solutions, is very important to the organisation. The interviewee explained that they are “not practitioners”, but deliver research that supports the work of practitioners.

The interviewee pointed out that they are “not a ‘think tank’” (i.e. they don’t define themselves as a ‘think tank’, and differentiate themselves from existing think tanks). Think tanks, she suggests, are primarily focused on conducting research and writing reports. This CSO does not have research staff as such. The research is conducted “on the side”, while the focus is on developing solutions. The CSO is also involved in “NGO advocacy”.

The main sources of funding are: EU governments and independent foundations. EU research is an important part of the CSO’s work and funding.

The CSO evolved out of a network-based policy organisation focusing on international relations. It was involved in business and political dialogue, and remains strongly committed to networking. However, it now focuses on a narrower range of issues. The CSO is involved in conferences and networks focusing on extremism. Networks include:

- CEDAR;
- RAN;
- EU policy planners network – the interviewee referred to a European network for policy makers directly involved in policy decisions—i.e. not the heads, but those at working level making policy decisions.

Opportunities to improve networking—including through EU funded projects. The interviewee said that s/he tends to see the same people at the events. S/he welcomes the opportunity to meet and share learning with “friends”. However, she notes that the participants are often not the practitioners—i.e. they are not working in the field. The practitioners are often too busy to attend networking events. The interviewee also worries that the learning is limited to a small network of people.
The interviewee is interested in how to reach practitioners who do not have time to attend events because they are delivering the work. The interviewee said: “the best people are often not there”. When asked about the types of practitioner roles that were relevant to networks, s/he referred specifically to youth workers, teachers and victim support. The interviewee suggested that new technologies can help provide learning opportunities to a wider group.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?
The CSO applies for "internal security programme funding", which offer more open calls, and for EU funded on specific, predefined topics. The CSO is currently working on an EU-funded security project.

The interviewee said that she was approached by a government organisation to participate in the project. The focus is on countering and preventing violence related to extremism—i.e. more democratic expressions of extremism are not included. The project proposal was rejected first time round, but funded the second time it was submitted. The project was timely in that it was submitted following a Norwegian terrorist incident involving extremists. The interviewee believes that it may have been the only project proposal submitted on the topic of countering extremism.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?
The interviewee spoke positively about the projects she has been involved in, and highlighted several positive outcomes:

- Developed solutions: The project has resulted in a range of outputs of benefit in tackling extremism, including: accessible learning materials and short films.
- Better able to implement solutions: The interviewee pointed out that, in the field of extremism, there is a lot of data and research, but far fewer solutions. The interviewee’s work with policy advisers shows that policy makers are willing to engage with CSOs. However, policy advisors are not necessarily willing to implement the solutions being proposed or delivered by CSOs. Policy makers argue that there is “no evidence that the solutions work”. Or say that the solutions are “too risky”.
- Sustainable networks – The CSO has been able to establish networks focusing on the problem of extremism, and these networks are still active. The funding for the EU-funded security project discussed ended about 4 months ago, but the CSO is continuing with its activities and networks.

The interview strongly believed in the value of CSO participation.
- Legitimacy and independence – In the field of extremism, the involvement of non-governmental organisations is important. In relation to extremism, a CSO’s role in a project is generally accepted by community-led organisations. However, the involvement of governmental organisations may be questioned: Why should this government department be
interested in terrorism / extremism? What right does another government have to “dictate to others?”

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

Yes. EU funding is important to the CSO.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The CSO leads on some projects, and is a partner on others. The CSO looks to lead in terms of “the content of the project” and identify the “learning” from the project. The CSO spoke positively about the projects that they are involved in.

The interviewee is particularly interested in research focusing on:
- “Counter-narrative” stories in UK and Germany;
- Lone actor terrorists.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The interviewee was clear that the CSO is very willing to be involved in EU-funded security research—which has become an important source of funding and activity. The interviewee pointed out that there is a lack of support for CSOs by government bodies in some countries (e.g. Eastern Europe). It is a “real struggle”. For them, funding from central Europe is extremely important for such CSOs. More should be done to enable CSOs from Eastern Europe to participate in EU-funded projects.

She identified a range of barriers to other CSOs participating such projects:
- Funding focused on new activities, not core activity – The EU does not fund existing frontline work conducted by CSOs, but on additional or new work. EU projects have to be conducted “on the side”. This can be difficult for CSOs which don’t have funding to deliver their core activities. The CSO has worked together with groups of CSOs. The interviewee found that the CSOs were often struggling to sustain their core activities. Unfortunately, it was often the good CSOs that were unable to take on a “side project”, in their experience.
- Funding gained by a limited number of organisations – The interviewee said that project funding tends to be obtained by the same organisations. It is “always the same organisations, and it is hard for new organisations”. When it comes to writing a funding proposal, they know what the funders are looking for.
- Lack of resources amongst many CSOs – The CSO pointed out that only a special sort of organisation can handle the bureaucracy associated with EU projects. Many CSOs don’t have the administrative staff and find EU projects a huge drain on resources. Most CSOs simply don’t have the capacity.
6. **Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?**

The interviewee mentioned:

- A NGO involved in EU-funded security research called Exit Deutschland that is an initiative to help anyone who wants to break with right-wing-extremism and to start a new life;
- CEDAR is a unique pan-European professional network, focused on the promotion of leadership, diversity and empowerment of European Muslims;
- Radicalism Awareness Network (RAN). In RAN, professionals exchange best practices in countering radicalisation and extremism

**Keywords:** intra-CSO capability; project participation assessment and friendly policy/programme framework.
Interviewee number 58.

0. Introduction

The interviewee is working for a small CSO (3 employees) located in the UK that specialises in waste management in disaster and crisis situations. The organisation travels to disasters worldwide to give advice, training and practical support. It is interested in spreading good practice and in environmental impact. It does make use of volunteers recruited through United Nations Volunteers (UNV) in Bonn, Germany. The interviewee explained that the organisation is not-for-profit because this is typical for organisations working in humanitarian aid / relief. The interviewee said that they do not have time to network with other CSOs. However, they had previously noted that the field of disaster management is dominated by CSOs. They were able to list a number of CSOs relevant to the field, including Oxfam and IRF. In addition, they do work with United Nations Volunteers (UNV), in Bonn, which is source of volunteers and therefore linked with CSOs. When asked the types of organisations they wanted to network with, they replied: cities and local authorities in crisis prone areas, as they have to respond in case of a disaster.

1. Has you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The CSO is involved in an EU-funded security project about crisis management following a disaster. Funded under FP7, this consortium project is large in terms of EU funding and numbers of partners. The CSO is a partner on the project. The 4-year research project has only just started, and it is therefore difficult to say much about the type of activities the CSO will be involved in. The interviewee anticipates: sharing experiences and knowledge; and feeding into test-bed situations.

The CSOs attends meetings / activities himself, along with 2 or 3 colleagues. The interviewer asked whether participation in project activities is problematic, in view of the CSO’s size (only 3 employees). The interviewee said that to date, this has not been a problem. As a project partner, the CSO is paid for its time participating in the security research project.

The interviewee said that he/she was approached by the security research project co-ordinator, about two years ago. They considered whether to become involved, and then said “yes”. They was interested in being involved in research that was new—i.e. had not been undertaken before. They hope that practical tools and systems will be generated by the project and that the CSO can make practical use of these in the field. The project also provides some networking opportunities.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The consortium project has only just started, so not much has been achieved to date, the interviewee said. While the interviewee could not comment specifically on the project, the interviewee was able to highlight some potential difficulties with large EU-funded security research projects. These views were based not just on his concerns and experience, but also
comments from other CSOs / organisations:

- Project co-ordination and partnership: The interviewee pointed out that, in large consortium projects at least, large organisations take the lead. As a result, there is a risk that the large companies formulate the project proposal and take the best roles for themselves, “leaving the crumbs” for the smaller organisations and/or CSOs. As a result, smaller organisations and CSOs in particular do not have much say.

- Participation by those with “hands on experience” (practice-based knowledge): The interview noted that the large consortium project comprised relatively few individuals / organisations with “hands on experience” of disaster management.

- Project proposal: The work package descriptions are rather vague in some cases. This leads to the consortium needing to discuss: a) whether to ask the person who wrote the work package to clarify what is wanted; or b) to undertake further research to understand what is really required. There is also discussion about how to proceed in relation to the project proposal: a) to attempt to deliver what has been outlined, even though this isn’t clear; or b) deliver what one thinks is required.

- Project deliverables: The focus of security research projects seems to be IT systems and complex modelling. In his view, simpler solutions are required for disaster management. For example, a solution might be as simple as an A4 cardboard crib sheet.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

While the CSO is only involved in one EU-funded security project, there are some other themes of interest to the CSO that link to other programmes: sustainability; and environmental impact.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The CSO would like to be involved in a smaller consortium project, where people with “hands on experience” have more say over the direction of the project and the project develops practical solutions that can be used in disaster situations.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The CSO is willing to be involved in EU-funded security research, but would like more say over the direction of the research, smaller consortia and more involvement with those with ‘hands on experience” (see answer 4).
6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

The interviewee was asked about other CSOs in the same field. These might be contacted, if considered suitable for interview. The CSOs mentioned were:

- Oxfam;
- International Relief Foundation (UK);
- MSB – Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency. This organisation may NOT be a CSO. It is steered by government, but may bring first hand knowledge of disaster situations—which the interviewee felt would be valuable.

**Keywords**: inter-CSO networking and trans-CSO networking
Interviewee number 59.

0. Introduction

The interviewee is working for a large CSO operating in the humanitarian aid sector. The organisation is not-for-profit, and is often involved in EU projects. The interviewee is a project manager on a EU-funded security project focusing on disaster management. The interviewee is new to EU-funded security research.

The organisation networks with locally based organisations, in particular local councils. It also networks with government organisations and Community Planning Partnerships.

The interviewee said that the organisation does identify with the term “civil society organisation”.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

As a large CSO focusing on humanitarian aid, the CSO is often involved in EU-funded research projects related to its core activities or goals. Research projects typically focus on: (a) first responders; (b) communities; and (c) disaster management.

The CSO is currently involved in a EU-funded security project on disaster management. [There is another CSO involved in the consortium]. The CSO is involved in two work packages, where it is undertaking research to (a) define the concept of “communities” and (b) categorise different communities. It is also responsible for identifying communities to study in urban and rural settings.

The CSO will conduct a review of existing literature. Current literature is rather ‘academic’ and/or ‘technical, said the interviewee. The CSO will help develop materials that are better suited to communicating with communities.

The interviewee recognises that the research project is funded under a “security” topic. However, s/he considers their work as belonging to the field of resilience or disaster management—rather than security. When asked to define ‘security research’, the interviewee said security focuses on issues such as terrorism and border control.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The interviewee finds it difficult to comment on the achievements of the project, which is ongoing. The interviewee said that things are still “coming together” for the project. They are in the process of “experimenting and testing” and that the results will be clearer in about one year’s time.

The research project aims to develop a toolkit that meets the needs of local communities. The CSO
is planning to use the outputs from the project. The CSO will also conduct a survey to evaluate the extent to which outputs help bring about change amongst communities.

The CSO has contributed to the research project by helping to identify locations that are relevant to the research. For instance, the interviewee has identified areas in the UK that are prone to severe weather problems and flooding. The CSO is supporting the project in its adoption of an “all hazards” approach to disaster management, and aims to “influence resilience thinking”.

The interviewee is new to EU-funded security projects, and therefore finds it difficult to make a judgement about the quality of the CSO’s input. However, the interviewee’s experiences are largely positive. The interviewee has participated in several meetings, and feels that project partners are interested in and committed to collaboration. Indeed, the interviewee commented positively about collaboration, saying: “we work well together” and “we explore things”.

In terms of influencing project direction, the interviewee said the project is making use of the CSO’s definition of resilience. In addition, the interviewee recognised the value of the CSO to the project. The interviewee said “we are practical”, and involved at the “sharp end”. This is the “added value” of the CSO’s participation, in the interviewee’s opinion.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

The interviewee has been involved in other EU-funded research, addressing for instance youth work.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The interviewee is happy with the EU-funded security research project to date and personally committed to its success. The interviewee welcomes the opportunity to help develop solutions, saying “I am a bit of a ‘fixer’. In addition, the interviewee is happy to contribute to discussions about potential projects / solutions.

The interviewee is interested in technological solutions. For example, s/he feels able to discuss the benefits and limitations of technical solutions to different problems and disaster scenarios (e.g. roads closing, multiple systems failing). However, s/he recognised that: “There is pressure on our time”. The interviewee said that opportunities are declined, if the project is not developing a solution that will work well in disaster situations. The CSO has been invited to participate in a project to develop an early warning system and has been in discussions regarding the development of apps.

The CSO is developing its own app to monitor situations. The interviewee is willing to participate in projects to develop technologies, but highlighted the importance of considering the impact of an event or disaster, as this can undermine effectiveness. The interviewee explained that a disaster
may have a wider impact on systems such as mobile phone services, electricity, etc. Apps for mobile phones are not suitable for circumstances where mobile phone systems are likely to fail. However, there are other technological systems that are more likely to function in disaster situations and might therefore be used for communication within particular groups, including digital radio for communities and police radios for police emergency services. Digital radio is “more robust” because radio transmitters are often located away from the disaster zone.

The scale of the disaster and the implications for solutions have to be taken into account. In the interviewee’s opinion, there is value in considering both “high tech” and “low tech” solutions. The interviewee highlighted the relevance of “Business Continuity” systems to cope with accidents and disasters, and said that apps may have a role to play in enabling business continuity.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The CSO is keen to participate in further EU-funded security research projects. However, the research must fit with the organisation’s mandate. The interviewee said that the CSO would not want to be involved if it became too “security-oriented”. When asked to elaborate, the interviewee said “security research focuses on terrorism and border control”, and on the “commercial sector”. This does not fit with the CSO’s mandate. The CSO is interested in “resilience” and “citizen security”.

The CSO is a large organisation with “worldwide” presence and therefore has the capacity to participate in EU-funded research. The interviewee said “our organisation is able to participate because it is (a) large and (b) has the necessary systems in place to deal with administration.

Many community-based CSOs are small. The interviewee identified barriers to small CSOs participating in EU-funded security research:

- Commissioning services, procurement and EU administration are all activities that are difficult for small CSOs.

The interviewee said that s/he had not heard about the security programme before becoming involved in the project. More could be done to communicate to CSOs.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

Further interviewees were not asked for.

Keywords: trans-CSO networking and project participation assessment
Interview number 60.

0. Introduction

The interviewee is a project manager working for a CSO (0 employees, 1 full time voluntary member of staff) located in Romania. The CSO specialises in supporting young people and raising their self-esteem. The CSO works with volunteers, but not does have a permanent group of volunteers. The CSO is not-for-profit. The CSO currently has an income of less than 10,000 EUR per year. The interviewee completed the SecurePART survey and agreed to be interviewed.

The CSO has been involved in projects on security related themes.

The organisation networks with local organisations, and works closely with a CSO in Spain. It participates in some EU networks on youth and environmental issues.

The organisation does identify as a “CSO”. The interviewee said that ‘civil’ meant “being present in the community or village”. However, the term NGO is used more commonly. The interviewee also mentioned that it is guided by Christian principles.

Trafficking of young people – The CSO has worked with girls and young women who have been trafficked. They provided counselling and helped the girls integrate back into the community.

Violence – About 5 years ago, the CSO participated in a project on violence that targeted schools. The CSO worked with school children, seeking to understand problems of violence (e.g. in the home) and offering opportunities to tackle problems and improve health.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The CSO has been involved in European projects through the Erasmus programme, including Youth In Action and Youth Exchanges.

When founded, the CSO received significant funding from the EU, around 1 million EUR. However, funding stopped once Romania joined the EU. Since then, the CSO has received EU funding for youth related work.

EU funding has been sought because the Romanian government provides very little funding and government funds are apparently difficult to access. The interviewee finds it difficult to explain the activities of the CSO in terms that meet the criteria for government support.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The EU is an important source of funding for the CSO. However, EU funding is only being used...
current to cover expenses. Amounts received typically range from 1,000 to 2,000 EUR for specific activities. Other sources of funding are schools and families, but the amount of funding gained is also very low.

EU funding has helped provide opportunities for young people. The interviewee said that Romania has been a “closed society”. If young people are given the opportunity to travel abroad, it enables them to “experience other cultures” and “opens their minds”.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

Yes, through the Erasmus programme. Funded programmes include: Youth in Action programme and Youth Exchanges to countries such as Bulgaria, UK and Spain.

In addition, the CSO received funding to support young people who had been raised in Romanian orphanages. Through a centre, young people raised in orphanages were helped to develop their self-esteem and given opportunities to study. Some also travelled abroad.

4. How would you like to be involved ideally?

The CSO is keen to participate in EU funded projects. The focus would need to be on helping young people. As mentioned, the CSO has covered violence and trafficking of people. The interviewee also mentioned being involved in environmental issues, such as climate change, dealing with problems of flooding and relief work.

5. What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?

The interviewee does not feel that s/he needs special help to participate in EU projects. The interviewee has a lot of experience, and feels comfortable managing projects. The CSO can find volunteers to help deliver projects.

6. Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?

Question not asked.

Keywords: involvement in project execution
Interviewee number 62.

0. Introduction

The interviewee is a partner in a research institute (RI) in the Netherlands. The RI focuses on research of benefit to society. S/he has a background in social issues (e.g. youth engagement), safety and security. However, in practice, the interviewer covers a broad range of topics. If no specialist is available within the RI, the interviewee takes on the research personally. The interviewee said “I do everything!” The RI is not for profit, but does not identify itself as a “CSO”. The interviewee described the organisation as an “independent” research organisation.

1. Have you or your organization been involved in European security and/or research?

The RI is involved in two EU-funded security projects, covering urban security and violent radicalisation. The RI routinely participates in EU-funded research.

The interviewee was asked by the consortium co-ordinator to participate in the EU-funded project on urban security. In relation to the urban security project, the RI is a partner. However, the RI is acting primarily in an advisory capacity. There are several other research organisations advising the consortium (including a university and a private company). As a result, the RI’s role in the research is rather limited / small. The interviewee would have liked the RI to have a greater role.

2. From your point of view, what has been achieved by participating in security and/or research? Are you satisfied with the results so far?

The interviewee cannot comment on the current EU-funded security project because their role in the project has been relatively small. In relation to other projects, the interviewee valued projects that were “good” at collecting data. When asked what s/he meant by “good”, the interview said “Good question! We have been involved in developing measurement instruments, and have been able to do this well. Other people said that our measurement instruments were good”.

3. Have you ever been invited or tried to be involved in any activity/project cooperation related with Framework Programme 7 / H2020 outside the security research theme?

Yes. The organisation covers a range of topics relevant to Horizon2020 including youth engagement, social inclusion and citizen participation. It examines the Horizon2020 calls, identifying themes that are relevant to the RI. In some cases, the RI writes the proposal and sets up the consortium. In other cases, it seeks out a co-ordinator / group of partners in order that the RI can join as a partner.

The RI likes the creativity involved in writing a funding proposal. All members of staff are able to help with bid writing and/or the preparation of an application—even junior members of staff. The RI adopts a standard approach to seeking funding, regardless of whether EU or national funding.
The RI considers: what should be done; what has been done before; what information is relevant; and how should the research be approached.

The interview conceded that it is a lot of work to prepare a funding proposal, and that the chances of success are low and/or uncertain. In some cases, a funding proposal receives a positive review with good scores, but is still not funded. Proposals with lower scores are sometimes funded, simply because fewer consortia have submitted proposals to a particular funding call.

4. **How would you like to be involved ideally?**
The RI seeks to be the co-ordinator on a small number of EU-funded projects. It seeks to be a partner on a larger number of projects. Ideally, the RI seeks an opportunity to conduct a significant amount of “good” research.

5. **What will increase your willingness or ability to be involved in Framework Programme 7 research?**
The RI is not seeking more EU funding. This is because of problems related to EU funding. In particular: a) insufficient funding to cover staff costs (i.e. relatively low daily rate); b) the administrative effort is considerable; and c) topics within EU funding calls are not always suitable for the RI. Rather, the RI aims to secure research funding from a variety of sources—not just from the EU.

- CSOs need to have the relevant expertise;
- CSOs need to understand how EU-funding works;
- If an organisation is new to EU-funded research, these factors are “huge barriers”.

6. **Are there other CSOs that might be willing to be interviewed?**
Yes. The interviewee suggested contacting CSOs involved in Restorative Justice research projects.

*Keywords*: project participation assessment and involvement in project execution.
8. Annex I

Completed forms collecting quantitative data from the 62 interviews.
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Trilateral Research &amp; Consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td>Security research expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Web survey completed? No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1 ▶ Professional activity in research/teaching
▶ Intellectual curiosity, hobby
▶ Societal and/or ethical concerns
▶ Political concerns
▶ No particular interest
▶ Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100
1 Uncompleted

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000
1 Uncompleted

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
1 Uncompleted

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
► Yes
► No
► Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)
► Health risks
► Environmental risks
► Peace in the world
► Privacy
► Cybersecurity
► Individual civil rights
► Minority’s rights
► Other concerns. Specify:
► No direct concern
► Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
► Yes
► No
► Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
► Yes
► No
1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
► Very usual
► Usual
► Occasional
► Rare
► Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
► International level
► European level
► National level
► Regional/local level
► Don’t know
1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: **Data protection, personal privacy, personal information**
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator/to expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research/research;
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify:**

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify:**

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specify:**

**Funding**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>EA European Academy of Technology and Innovation Assessment GmbH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview accessed: Studies within the EU-Project “PROmoting Global REsponsible research”

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1

Professional activity in research/teaching

Intellectual curiosity, hobby

Societal and/or ethical concerns

Political concerns

No particular interest

Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity

*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: ____________________________
- Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
| **2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?**  
* (Two choices admitted) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2.4 How many employees has the CSO?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 500-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?**  
* (Several choices admitted) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100.00€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100.000€ and 250.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Specific activity of a CSO**  
* (Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research? *(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other concerns. Specify: ethical and biosecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ... 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

Aviation,
Maritime,
Borders,
Infrastructure protection;
Counter-terror intelligence,
Crisis management/civil protection,
Physical protection,
Protective clothing
1 Other. Specify: ethical and biosecurity

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

Observer
Influencer
Programme evaluator
Project evaluator
1 Actor of research
User of research
Commissioner of research
Disseminator
1 Other. Specify
None of them
Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

Yes
No
1 Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

Yes
No
1 Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1 Yes
No
Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>CROSS BORDER RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security research expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 - Low |
| 3 - Medium |
| 5 - High |

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 - Low |
| 3 - Medium |
| 5 - High |

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 - Low |
| 3 - Medium |
| 5 - High |

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

| Professional activity in research/teaching |
| Intellectual curiosity, hobby |
| Societal and/or ethical concerns |
| Political concerns |
| No particular interest |
| Others |

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

1. Less than one year
2. Between 1-2 years
3. Between 3-5 years
4. Between 5-10 years
5. More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

1. Very high. It is a daily environment
2. High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
3. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
4. Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
5. Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

1. Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
2. Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
3. Human rights group or network
4. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
5. Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
6. Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
7. Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
8. Professional association or group
9. Student group
10. Trade union and employers’ organization
11. Academic association or network
12. Women’s organization
13. Faith-based organization
14. Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
15. Other. Specify:
16. Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

1. International
2. European
3. National
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2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100
1 Uncompleted

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000
1 Uncompleted

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
1 Uncompleted

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted
### 3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: ________________
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: ________________
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

#### 4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify: Founding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>European Forum for Urban Security (Efus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Framework interview

Participation in NMFRDISASTER PROJECT and in many others SEC

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

1. Less than one year
2. Between 1-2 years
3. Between 3-5 years
4. Between 5-10 years
5. More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

1. Very high. It is a daily environment
2. High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
3. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
4. Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
5. Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

1. Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
2. Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
3. Human rights group or network
4. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
5. Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
6. Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
7. Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
8. Professional association or group
9. Student group
10. Trade union and employers’ organization
11. Academic association or network
12. Women’s organization
13. Faith-based organization
14. Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
15. Other. Specify:
16. Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

1. International
2. European
3. National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
## 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>► CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Others. Specify: Administrative system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Others. Specify: Labourious administrative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. Additional aspects

### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify: Better threats, know possible solutions and to know current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Science Shop Bonn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview | Participation in PERARES project

Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional activity in research/teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity, hobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal and/or ethical concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

1. Yes
2. No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

1. International level
2. European level
3. National level
4. Regional/local level
5. Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? (Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
1
- Other. Specify: Personal Data protection
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: (three choices admitted)
- Observer
1
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research research);
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
1
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(three choices admitted)

Internal barriers

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: __________________________

External barriers

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: __________________________

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

1. The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
2. The activity reflects the position only a part
3. The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
4. Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

1. The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
2. The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
3. Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

1. Larger societal impact
2. Internal demand of members in the CSO
3. Programme/funding availability
4. Collaboration with other stakeholders
5. Collaboration with other CSOs
6. Collaboration with government
7. Other. Specify: __________________________
8. Don’t know

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

1. Ethical obligation
2. Mandate from the statutes
3. Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
4. Interpretation of civil society demands
5. Request from other CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>GLOBAL RISK FORUM GRF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Participation in PEP and DITAC project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected manager (not staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer / active member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant at the activities / follower of their positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. CSO identity**

*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*

**2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs? (Two choices admitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4 How many employees has the CSO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 500-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns? (Several choices admitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100.00€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100.000€ and 250.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Specific activity of a CSO (Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: Funding for writing proposals

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: Administrative data and financial reporting

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: 
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>MAGEN DAVID ADOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Participation in NMFRESDISASTER PROJECT and in many others SEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Web survey completed? | No |

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 500

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.00€
- Between 250.00€ and 1.000.00€
- Between 1.000.00€ and 5.000.00€
- More than 5.000.00€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► Health risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Environmental risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Peace in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Individual civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Minority’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Other concerns. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► Very usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>► Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>► International level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Regional/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: Administrative system

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: Labourious administrative data

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: Enter the threats, know possible solutions and know current
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION FRANCAISE DE NORMALISATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Participation in CRESCENDO project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Elected manager (not staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Volunteer / active member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participant at the activities / follower of their positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Less than one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Very high. It is a daily environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*(Two choices admitted)*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Staff structure /size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of interest in civil society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Larger societal impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethical obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>DE MONTFORT UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group/s (pre-defined list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Framework interview**

Coordinator of CONSIDER - Civil society OrgaNisationS In Designing rEsea

**Web survey completed?**

No

### 1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
<th>3 - Medium</th>
<th>5 - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
<th>3 - Medium</th>
<th>5 - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
<th>3 - Medium</th>
<th>5 - High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: collaboration in a security research project

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National

1 Uncompleted
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs? 
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100
- Uncompleted

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000
- Uncompleted

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns? 
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
- Uncompleted

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*Several choices admitted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Fundación para el conocimiento MADRIDMASD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Participation in OSMOSIS project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected manager (not staff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer / active member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant at the activities / follower of their positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

| Less than one year                          |
| Between 1-2 years                           |
| Between 3-5 years                           |
| Between 5-10 years                          |
| More than 10 years                          |

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

| Very high. It is a daily environment        |
| High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment |
| Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year) |
| Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years) |
| Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent. |

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

| Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group |
| Development or ‘Peace’ NGO                            |
| Human rights group or network                         |
| Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group) |
| Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group) |
| Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment |
| Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute |
| Professional association or group                     |
| Student group                                          |
| Trade union and employers’ organization               |
| Academic association or network                       |
| Women’s organization                                  |
| Faith-based organization                              |
| Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation) |
| Other. Specify:                                       |
| Don’t know                                            |

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

| International    |
| European         |
| National         |
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
*(Several choices admitted)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aviation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maritime,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Borders,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Infrastructure protection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counter-terror intelligence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crisis management/civil protection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical protection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
*(three choices admitted)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme evaluator expectations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actor of research research;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disseminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*Note: Three choices admitted*

#### Internal barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Staff structure / size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ CSO mandates / priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Inappropriate staff skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Lack of interest in civil society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the CSO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons behind CSO involvement</th>
<th>Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>German security European association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Framework interview Participation in ARCHIMEDES project
Web survey completed? no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 | Low |
| 3 | Medium |
| 5 | High |

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 | Low |
| 3 | Medium |
| 5 | High |

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| 1 | Low |
| 3 | Medium |
| 5 | High |

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

| 1 | Professional activity in research/teaching |
|  | Intellectual curiosity, hobby |
|  | Societal and/or ethical concerns |
|  | Political concerns |
|  | No particular interest |
|  | Others |

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 **Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?**  
(Two choices admitted)

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 **How many employees has the CSO?**

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 **How many members/friends has the CSO?**

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

2.6 **How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?**  
(Several choices admitted)

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 **How much budget is available for the CSO by year?**

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. **Specific activity of a CSO**  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- [ ] Health risks
- [ ] Environmental risks
- [ ] Peace in the world
- [ ] Privacy
- [ ] Cybersecurity
- [ ] Individual civil rights
- [ ] Minority’s rights
- [ ] Other concerns. Specify:
- [ ] No direct concern
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- [ ] Very usual
- [ ] Usual
- [ ] Occasional
- [ ] Rare
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- [ ] International level
- [ ] European level
- [ ] National level
- [ ] Regional/local level
- [ ] Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
*(Several choices admitted)*

- 1 ► Aviation,  
- 1 ► Maritime,  
- 1 ► Borders,  
- 1 ► Infrastructure protection;  
- 1 ► Counter-terror intelligence,  
- 1 ► Crisis management/civil protection,  
- 1 ► Physical protection,  
- 1 ► Protective clothing  
- ► Other. Specify:  
- ► Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
*(three choices admitted)*

- ► Observer  
- ► Influencer  
- ► Programme evaluator/expectations;  
- ► Project evaluator  
- ► Actor of research/research);  
- ► User of research  
- ► Commissioner of research  
- ► Disseminator  
- 1 ► Other. Specify: Setting innovation requirements for end users  
- ► None of them  
- ► Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- 1 ► Yes  
- ► No  
- ► Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- 1 ► Yes  
- ► No  
- ► Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- 1 ► Yes  
- ► No  
- ► Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others.

Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others.

Specify:

---

**5. Additional aspects**

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

**5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement**

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other

Specify:

Don’t know

**5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation**

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>FUNDACAO PARA A CIENCIA E A TECNOLOGIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td>SECURITY NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

| 1. Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group |
| 2. Development or ‘Peace’ NGO |
| 3. Human rights group or network |
| 4. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group) |
| 5. Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group) |
| 6. Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment |
| 7. Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute |
| 8. Professional association or group |
| 9. Student group |
| 10. Trade union and employers’ organization |
| 11. Academic association or network |
| 12. Women’s organization |
| 13. Faith-based organization |
| 14. Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation) |
| 15. Other. Specify: |
| 16. Don’t know |

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

| 1. International |
| 2. European |
| 3. National |
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
► At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
► At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
► Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
► Less than 10
► Between 10-25
► Between 25-50
► Between 50-100
► More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
► Less than 50
► Between 50-100
► Between 100-500
► Between 500- 5000
► More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
► Commonly associated with security concerns
► Indirectly associated with security concerns
► Commonly associated with research issues
► Indirectly associated with research issues
► Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
► Less than 100.00€
► Between 100.00€ and 250.000€
► Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
► Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
► More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: *Data protection, personal privacy, personal information*
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(*three choices admitted*)

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: societal concerns no security end user needs

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don't know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don't know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don't know

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview | SecurePART stakeholders board member

Web survey completed? | no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation
- Maritime
- Borders
- Infrastructure protection
- Counter-terror intelligence
- Crisis management/civil protection
- Physical protection
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

**three choices admitted**

#### Internal barriers

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
  - Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
  - Others. Specify:

#### External barriers

- Lack of interest in civil society
  - Others. Specify:
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
  - 1 Uncompleted

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
  - 1 Uncompleted

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other
  - Specify:
- Don’t know
  - 1 Uncompleted

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs

---

90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>International Red Cross and Danish Red Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Anonymised

Framework interview

- Participant in OPSIC and NMFRDISASTER
- Project coordinator of SR project

Web survey completed? No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewer can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research? (Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specify:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation
- Maritime
- Borders
- Infrastructure protection
- Counter-terror intelligence
- Crisis management/civil protection
- Physical protection
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: 
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify: <strong>Administrative system</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Pole Pegase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td>FP7 SR project partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Web survey completed? no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:

- Don’t know

Uncompleted

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*(Two choices admitted)*

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
Specify:  
- No direct concern
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No
1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group/s (pre-defined list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

Anonymised

Framework interview: CSO participant in FP7 and active in Security

Web survey completed? No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
1
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
1
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
1
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
1
- Commonly associated with security concerns
1
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
1
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>Specify:</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? 
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: 
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now? 
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

Name & surname: Anonymised
Position: Anonymised
Organisation: Bundesnetzwerk Bürgerschaftliches Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Web survey completed? No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
### 1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify: 

### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity

*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specify: __________

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? 
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation, 
- Maritime, 
- Borders, 
- Infrastructure protection; 
- Counter-terror intelligence, 
- Crisis management/civil protection, 
- Physical protection, 
- Protective clothing 
  - Other. Specify: 
  - Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: 
(three choices admitted)

- Observer 
- Influencer 
- Programme evaluator expectations; 
- Project evaluator 
- Actor of research research); 
- User of research 
- Commissioner of research 
- Disseminator 
- Other. Specify 
- None of them 
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

### 5. Additional aspects

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

| 1 | The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole |
| 1 | The activity reflects the position only a part |
| 1 | The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved |
| 1 | Don’t know |

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

| 1 | The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders |
| 1 | The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders |
| 1 | Don’t know |

### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

| 1 | Larger societal impact |
| 1 | Internal demand of members in the CSO |
| 1 | Programme/funding availability |
| 1 | Collaboration with other stakeholders |
| 1 | Collaboration with other CSOs |
| 1 | Collaboration with government |
| 1 | Other Specify: |
| 1 | Don’t know |

### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| 1 | Ethical obligation |
| 1 | Mandate from the statutes |
| 1 | Bottom-up demand from the CSO members |
| 1 | Interpretation of civil society demands |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request from other CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>INTERPOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Coordinator of CWIT project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Web survey completed? | no |

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*(Two choices admitted)*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO  
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

Specify:

1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know
1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? *(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>G4S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised
Framework interview | SecurePART stakeholders board member
Web survey completed? | no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

1 Uncompleted

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

1 Uncompleted

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.00€
- Between 250.00€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

1 Uncompleted

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify

- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*three choices admitted*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

### 5. Additional aspects

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position only a part</th>
<th>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</th>
<th>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Larger societal impact</th>
<th>Internal demand of members in the CSO</th>
<th>Programme/funding availability</th>
<th>Collaboration with other stakeholders</th>
<th>Collaboration with other CSOs</th>
<th>Collaboration with government</th>
<th>Other Specify:</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Uncompleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethical obligation</th>
<th>Mandate from the statutes</th>
<th>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</th>
<th>Interpretation of civil society demands</th>
<th>Request from other CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>PAIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview
SecurePART board member and participant in security research projects

Web survey completed? no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1. Elected manager (not staff)
   - Staff
   - Volunteer / active member
   - Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
   1. Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
   - Irrelevant

Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

1.

1. Less than one year
   - Between 1-2 years
   - Between 3-5 years
   - Between 5-10 years
   - More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

1.

1. Very high. It is a daily environment
   - High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
   1. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times a year)
   - Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
   - Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
  - Other. Specify:
  1. Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?

(Two choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-25</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25-50</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100-500</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 500-5000</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5000</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with security concerns</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with security concerns</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with research issues</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with research issues</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100.00€</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100.000€ and 250.000€</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5.000.000€</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.

Specify:  

- No direct concern
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

1 Uncompleted

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research research);
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Pax Christy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview | SecurePART expert board member

Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?  
(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify: ____________________

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
► Aviation,
► Maritime,
► Borders,
► Infrastructure protection;
► Counter-terror intelligence,
► Crisis management/civil protection,
► Physical protection,
► Protective clothing
► Other. Specify:
► Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
► Observer
► Influencer
► Programme evaluator
► Project evaluator
► Actor of research
► User of research
► Commissioner of research
► Disseminator
► Other. Specify
► None of them
► Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
1 ▶ Yes
▶ No
▶ Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?
1 ▶ Yes
▶ No
▶ Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
1 ▶ Yes
▶ No
▶ Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*three choices admitted*

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
  
**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders

**5. Additional aspects**

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don't know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don't know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
  
**Other**  
Specify:  

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request from other CSOs</th>
<th>Request from public institutions</th>
<th>Request from SR actors</th>
<th>Other Specify:</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Tecnalia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

Coordinator of Innosec project

Web survey completed? no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected manager (not staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer / active member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant at the activities / follower of their positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*Two choices admitted*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*Several choices admitted*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.00€
- Between 250.00€ and 1.000.00€
- Between 1.000.00€ and 5.000.00€
- More than 5.000.00€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.

Specify:

- No direct concern
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No
- Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**
- 1 ▶ Staff structure / size
- ▶ CSO mandates / priorities
- 1 ▶ Inappropriate staff skills
- ▶ Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- ▶ Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- ▶ Others. Specify:

**External barriers**
- ▶ Lack of interest in civil society
- 1 ▶ Complexity of the environment to intervene
- ▶ Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- ▶ Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- ▶ Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
- 1 Uncompleted

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
- 1 Uncompleted

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know
- 1 Uncompleted

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Haut Comité Français pour la Défense Civile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview | Project partner at CBRNE and Practice
Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
### 1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify: 

### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
  - Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research? (Several choices admitted)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other concerns. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research research;
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(*three choices admitted*)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Less than one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very high. It is a daily environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
 *(Two choices admitted)*

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
 *(Several choices admitted)*

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
 *(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- Specify:

- No direct concern
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

1 Uncompleted

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? (Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: Data protection, personal privacy, personal information
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: (three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

1 Uncompleted

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

1
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know
- Uncompleted

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>CDTI - Spanish Agency of Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>No framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web survey completed?</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 1. Implication and knowledge

### 1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| ► 1 - Low |
| ▶ 3 - Medium |

### 1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| ► 1 - Low |
| ▶ 3 - Medium |

### 1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

| ► 1 - Low |
| ▶ 3 - Medium |

### 1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

### 1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)  
► At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)  
► At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)  
► Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
1► Less than 10  
► Between 10-25  
► Between 25-50  
► Between 50-100  
► More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
1► Less than 50  
► Between 50-100  
► Between 100-500  
► Between 500-5000  
► More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)  
1► Commonly associated with security concerns  
► Indirectly associated with security concerns  
1► Commonly associated with research issues  
► Indirectly associated with research issues  
► Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
1► Less than 100.00€  
► Between 100.000€ and 250.000€  
► Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€  
► Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€  
► More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.

Specify:

- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
### 3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology/ies</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure protection;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-terror intelligence,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management/civil protection,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

**4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?**

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?**

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

1. Staff structure / size
2. CSO mandates / priorities
3. Inappropriate staff skills
4. Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
5. Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
6. Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

1. Lack of interest in civil society
2. Complexity of the environment to intervene
3. Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
4. Poor relationship with other stakeholders
5. Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Fondation Sciences Citoyennes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview

Framework interview | Project partner at PERARES

Web survey completed?

Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or 'Peace' NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
1. Less than 10
2. Between 10-25
3. Between 25-50
4. Between 50-100
5. More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
1. Less than 50
2. Between 50-100
3. Between 100-500
4. Between 500- 5000
5. More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
1. Commonly associated with security concerns
2. Indirectly associated with security concerns
3. Commonly associated with research issues
4. Indirectly associated with research issues
5. Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
1. Less than 100.00€
2. Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
3. Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
4. Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
5. More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research? (Several choices admitted)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority's rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don't know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ... 
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don't know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don't know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: Administrative system

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don't know

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don't know

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don't know

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Austrian Red Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview | Participant in Innosec, DRIVER and CPSI

Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected manager (not staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer / active member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant at the activities / follower of their positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development or 'Peace' NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other concerns. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? 
(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-terror intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management/civil protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: 
(three choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Staff structure /size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify: Administrative system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Lack of interest in civil society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Larger societal impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Ethical obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Berliner Fahrgastverband IGEB e.V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: Anonymised

Framework interview: interested in SR, but not participating on EU-level

Web survey completed?:

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
1. More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
1. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
1. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?

*(Two choices admitted)*

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO

*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*Several choices admitted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>Specify: surveillance and transportsecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: [surveillance]
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Deutscher Feuerwehrverband e.V. (DFV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administr.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Anonymised

Framework interview personal contact, and important enduser for security technology

Web survey completed? 197

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
*(Two choices admitted)*  
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
*(Several choices admitted)*  
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?  
*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Health risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other concerns. Specify: civil protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very usual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>International level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>European level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others. Specify: administrative and financial costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>BAGIV - Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft der Immigrantenverbände</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview selected, because BAGIV seemed to be a potential victim of security issues.

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
(no Information given out)
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- User of research
- Project evaluator
- Researcher
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>SGKV Studiengesellschaft für den kombinierten Verkehr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised |

Framework interview | participated in SR projects |

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?  
(Several choices admitted)

1. Health risks  
2. Environmental risks  
3. Peace in the world  
4. Privacy  
5. Cybersecurity  
6. Individual civil rights  
7. Minority’s rights  
8. Other concerns. Specify: transport security

9. No direct concern  
10. Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

1. Yes  
2. No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

1. Very usual  
2. Usual  
3. Occasional  
4. Rare  
5. Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

1. International level  
2. European level  
3. National level  
4. Regional/local level  
5. Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: transport
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: application and administrational costs

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>DRK (security research department)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview participant in different FP7-SEC projects

Web survey completed? 218

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1 - Professional activity in research/teaching
   - Intellectual curiosity, hobby
   - Societal and/or ethical concerns
   - Political concerns
   - No particular interest
   - Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
| 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4 How many employees has the CSO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 500-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with security concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly associated with research issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100.00€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100.000€ and 250.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5.000.000€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

1. Health risks
2. Environmental risks
3. Peace in the world
4. Privacy
5. Cybersecurity
6. Individual civil rights
7. Minority’s rights
8. Other concerns. Specify:
9. No direct concern
10. Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

1. Yes
2. No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been...

1. Very usual
2. Usual
3. Occasional
4. Rare
5. Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

1. International level
2. European level
3. National level
4. Regional/local level
5. Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(*Several choices admitted*)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(*three choices admitted*)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research;
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(*When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields*)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(*Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)*)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: ____________________________

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: ____________________________

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: ____________________________
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Österreichisches Rotes Kreuz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Anonymised

Framework interview participated in SR projects

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: Federal Rescue Commander
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.

Specify: civil protection
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(*Several choices admitted*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Maritime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Infrastructure protection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Counter-terror intelligence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Crisis management/civil protection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Physical protection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Protective clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Other.  Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(*three choices admitted*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Influencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Programme evaluator/expectations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Project evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Actor of research/research);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► User of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Commissioner of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Disseminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Other.  Specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► None of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(*When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(*Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>► Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>► Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>GESA German European Security Association e.V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview participant in FP7-SEC

Web survey completed?

232

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*(Two choices admitted)*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify: [innovation]

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing

1 Other. Specify: [innovation of security research program]

- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator

1 Other. Specify

- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? 
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: pre-finances

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

1. The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
2. The activity reflects the position only a part
3. The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
4. Don't know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

1. The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
2. The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
3. Don't know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

1. Larger societal impact
2. Internal demand of members in the CSO
3. Programme/funding availability
4. Collaboration with other stakeholders
5. Collaboration with other CSOs
6. Collaboration with government
7. Other. Specify:
8. Don't know

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

1. Ethical obligation
2. Mandate from the statutes
3. Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
4. Interpretation of civil society demands
5. Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request from public institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Request from SR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

Name & surname | Anonymised
Position | Anonymised
Organisation | Stiftung Weltweit – German Institute for International and Security

Group/s (pre-defined list)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised
Framework interview | contacted after desk research
Web survey completed? | yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Less than one year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Very high. It is a daily environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*(Two choices admitted)*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation
- Maritime
- Borders
- Infrastructure protection
- Counter-terror intelligence
- Crisis management/civil protection
- Physical protection
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure /size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Eastern Europe Studies Center - EESC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>ENNA network / interest in H2020 funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low 1 points - Expert 5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low 1 points - Expert 5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low 1 points - Expert 5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional activity in research/teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity, hobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal and/or ethical concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?

*Two choices admitted*

- 1 At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- 1 At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?

*Several choices admitted*

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO

*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)  
- Aviation,  
- Maritime,  
- Borders,  
- Infrastructure protection;  
- Counter-terror intelligence,  
- Crisis management/civil protection,  
- Physical protection,  
- Protective clothing  
1 Other. Specify: civil society and democracy  
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)  
- Observer  
- Influencer  
- Programme evaluator/expectations;  
- Project evaluator  
1 Actor of research;  
- User of research  
- Commissioner of research  
- Disseminator  
1 Other. Specify: leading organization  
- None of them  
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement  
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)  
1 Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?  
1 Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?  
1 Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

Name & surname | Anonymised
Position | Anonymised
Organisation | Hungarian Association for Migrants (Menedek)

Group/s (pre-defined list)
- CSO
- Research
- Industry
- Academia
- Consultant
- Administrat.
- Facilitator

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1. Elected manager (not staff)

- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify: when related to migration, in general; sec...
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: **everything that is related to international migration (border)**
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

### Internal barriers
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others.

### External barriers
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others.

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Artemisszio Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview | ENNA member recommendation / experience in security issues

Web survey completed? | not known

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1. The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)
1. At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
2. At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
3. Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
1. Less than 10
2. Between 10-25
3. Between 25-50
4. Between 50-100
5. More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
1. Less than 50
2. Between 50-100
3. Between 100-500
4. Between 500- 5000
5. More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)
1. Commonly associated with security concerns
2. Indirectly associated with security concerns
3. Commonly associated with research issues
4. Indirectly associated with research issues
5. Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
1. Less than 100.00€
2. Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
3. Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
4. Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
5. More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

Specify: immigration

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

1

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

1

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

1
### 3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: `what is connected with rising extremism`
- Don’t know

### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

#### 4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

#### 4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

#### 4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? 
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- 1 ➤ Staff structure / size
- 1 ➤ CSO mandates / priorities
- ➤ Inappropriate staff skills
- ➤ Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- ➤ Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- 1 ➤ Others. Specify: _______

**External barriers**

- ➤ Lack of interest in civil society
- 1 ➤ Complexity of the environment to intervene
- ➤ Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- 1 ➤ Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- ➤ Others. Specify: _______

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- 1 The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- 1 Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- 1 Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: _______
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Estonian Fund for Nature (ELF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised
Framework interview | ENNA network
Web survey completed? | not known

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: environmental
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
*Two choices admitted*
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
*Several choices admitted*
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO
*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.

Specify: wild life rehabilitation

- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: ____________
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: ____________
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure /size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: funding

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: not enough information, dissemination targeted to CSOs

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Initiatives – DVI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group/s (pre-defined list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>ENNA members recommendation / organization interested in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web survey completed?</th>
<th>not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Implication and knowledge

#### 1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

#### 1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

#### 1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

#### 1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

#### 1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

Name & surname: Anonymised

Position: Anonymised

Organisation: Sustainable Development Initiatives – DVI

Contact: Anonymised

Framework interview: ENNA members recommendation / organization interested in

Web survey completed?: not known
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: __________
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?

(Two choices admitted)

- **1** At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- **1** At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- **1** Less than 10
- **1** Between 10-25
- **1** Between 25-50
- **1** Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- **1** Less than 50
- **1** Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?

(Several choices admitted)

- **1** Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- **1** Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Don’t know**

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

**Specify:**

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Don’t know**

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- **Yes**
- **No**

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: practitioner with big knowledge on the public opinion on
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others.

Specify: more experience on research

**External barriers**
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others.

Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other
- Specify: more experience on research
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>InePA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

ENNA network / collaborators; involved in FP7 projects on security

Web survey completed?

not known

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

1 - Low
3 - Medium
5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1 - Professional activity in research/teaching
   - Intellectual curiosity, hobby
   - Societal and/or ethical concerns
   - Political concerns
   - No particular interest
   - Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1. Elected manager (not staff)
2. Staff
3. Volunteer / active member
4. Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
5. Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
6. Irrelevant
7. Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
1. Less than one year
2. Between 1-2 years
3. Between 3-5 years
4. Between 5-10 years
5. More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
1. Very high. It is a daily environment
2. High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
3. Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
4. Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
5. Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
1. Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
2. Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
3. Human rights group or network
4. Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
5. Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
6. Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
7. Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
8. Professional association or group
9. Student group
10. Trade union and employers’ organization
11. Academic association or network
12. Women’s organization
13. Faith-based organization
14. Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
15. Other. Specify:
16. Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
1. International
2. European
3. National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
*(Several choices admitted)*
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
  - Specify: open data
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- 1 ► Staff structure / size
- 1 ► CSO mandates / priorities
- ▶ Inappropriate staff skills
- ▶ Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- ▶ Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- 1 ► Others. Specify: 

**External barriers**

- 1 ► Lack of interest in civil society
- 1 ► Complexity of the environment to intervene
- 1 ► Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- ▶ Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- 1 ► Others. Specify: transparency issues when different calls are drafted

5. Additional aspects

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don't know

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don't know

**5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement**

- 1 Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- 1 Collaboration with other stakeholders
- 1 Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- 1 Other Specify: projects, in order to make them more accessible to othe
- Don't know

**5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation**

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Free-lancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/s (pre-defined list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(*Several choices admitted*)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

Specify:

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at ...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluatorexpectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of researchresearch);
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Others. Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Staff structure / size</td>
<td>► CSO mandates / priorities</td>
<td>► Inappropriate staff skills</td>
<td>► Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
<td>► Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
<td>► Others. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Others. Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► Lack of interest in civil society</td>
<td>► Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
<td>► Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
<td>► Others. Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</th>
<th>The activity reflects the position only a part</th>
<th>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</th>
<th>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Larger societal impact</th>
<th>Internal demand of members in the CSO</th>
<th>Programme/funding availability</th>
<th>Collaboration with other stakeholders</th>
<th>Collaboration with other CSOs</th>
<th>Collaboration with government</th>
<th>Other Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethical obligation</th>
<th>Mandate from the statutes</th>
<th>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</th>
<th>Interpretation of civil society demands</th>
<th>Request from other CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify Other: [ ]
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>The Foundation for an Open Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview | ENNA member recommendation / experience on security issues
Web survey completed? | yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is...
- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Specify: ________

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

298
### 3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

*Several choices admitted*

- Aviation,  
- Maritime,  
- Borders,  
- Infrastructure protection;  
- Counter-terror intelligence,  
- Crisis management/civil protection,  
- Physical protection,  
- Protective clothing  
- Other. Specify:  
- Don’t know

### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

*Three choices admitted*

- Observer  
- Influencer  
- Programme evaluator  
- Project evaluator  
- Actor of research  
- User of research  
- Commissioner of research  
- Disseminator  
- Other. Specify:  
- None of them  
- Don’t know

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

#### 4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields*

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

#### 4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)*

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know

#### 4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes  
- No  
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify: ____________________________

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: the laws of secrecy and lack of access to information

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: ____________________________
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>ApTI - The Association for Technology and Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td>ENNA collaborators / experience in security issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: association
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)

1. At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
2. At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

1. Less than 10
2. Between 10-25
3. Between 25-50
4. Between 50-100
5. More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

1. Less than 50
2. Between 50-100
3. Between 100-500
4. Between 500-5000
5. More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)

1. Commonly associated with security concerns
2. Indirectly associated with security concerns
3. Commonly associated with research issues
4. Indirectly associated with research issues
5. Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

1. Less than 100.00€
2. Between 100.00€ and 250.00€
3. Between 250.00€ and 1.000.00€
4. Between 1.000.00€ and 5.000.00€
5. More than 5.000.00€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>Specify: digital civil rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: surveillance
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Staff structure / size
2. CSO mandates / priorities
3. Inappropriate staff skills
4. Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
5. Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
6. Others. Specify: lack of appropriate funds

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lack of interest in civil society
2. Complexity of the environment to intervene
3. Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
4. Poor relationship with other stakeholders
5. Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
2. The activity reflects the position only a part
3. The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
4. Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
2. The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
3. Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Larger societal impact
2. Internal demand of members in the CSO
3. Programme/funding availability
4. Collaboration with other stakeholders
5. Collaboration with other CSOs
6. Collaboration with government
7. Other Specify: access to information
8. Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical obligation
Mandate from the statutes
Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
Interpretation of civil society demands
Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>The National Network of Civil Society - BBE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>ENNA member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Web survey completed?   | yes |

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs? (Two choices admitted)

1. At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
2. At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
3. Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

1. Less than 10
2. Between 10-25
3. Between 25-50
4. Between 50-100
5. More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

1. Less than 50
2. Between 50-100
3. Between 100-500
4. Between 500-5000
5. More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns? (Several choices admitted)

1. Commonly associated with security concerns
2. Indirectly associated with security concerns
3. Commonly associated with research issues
4. Indirectly associated with research issues
5. Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

1. Less than 100.00€
2. Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
3. Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
4. Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
5. More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

► Yes
► No
► Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

► Health risks
► Environmental risks
► Peace in the world
► Privacy
► Cybersecurity
► Individual civil rights
► Minority’s rights
► Other concerns. Specify: human rights, everything related to migration
► No direct concern
► Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

► Yes
► No
► Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

► Yes
► No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

► Very usual
► Usual
► Occasional
► Rare
► Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

► International level
► European level
► National level
► Regional/local level
► Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing

1  
- Other. Specify: civil right, migrants
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

1  
- Observer
1  
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
1  
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
1  
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

1  
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
1  
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

**External barriers**

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**0. Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Estonian Human Rights Center (EHRC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>ENNA network / experience in research and security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web survey completed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1. Implication and knowledge**

1.1 *Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...*  
*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 *Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...*  
*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 *Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...*  
*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 *Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...* 

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 *Latest position in the CSO is...*
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Specify: [impact of new technologies on human rights]*

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: __________________________
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: __________________________
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? (three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others. Specify: funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others. Specify: not enough funding/small CSOs can’t manage a big budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>The National Association for Large Families - Hungary / EESC Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview Meeting at one EESC plenary

Web survey completed? yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: _Board member (Vice-president)_
- Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
Regional/local

Other

Don’t know

2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)

1 At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)

1 At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)

Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

Less than 10

1 Between 10-25

1 Between 25-50

1 Between 50-100

1 More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

Less than 50

1 Between 50-100

1 Between 100-500

1 Between 500- 5000

1 More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)

1 Commonly associated with security concerns

1 Indirectly associated with security concerns

1 Commonly associated with research issues

1 Indirectly associated with research issues

Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

Less than 100.00€

1 Between 100.000€ and 250.000€

1 Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€

1 Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€

1 More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: human/family/children's rights
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: influencer in terms of recommending different policy initiatives
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? (three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Center for Community Organizing Middle Moravia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/s (pre-defined list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high. It is a daily environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development or ‘Peace’ NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights group or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby group (pressure group, private &amp; business interest group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union and employers’ organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic association or network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 10-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Between 25-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Between 50-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 100-500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 500- 5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonly associated with security concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirectly associated with security concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonly associated with research issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirectly associated with research issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 100.00€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 100.000€ and 250.000€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5.000.000€</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

|   | 1 ➤ Aviation, |
|   | 1 ➤ Maritime, |
|   | 1 ➤ Borders, |
|   | 1 ➤ Infrastructure protection; |
|   | 1 ➤ Counter-terror intelligence, |
|   | 1 ➤ Crisis management/civil protection, |
|   | 1 ➤ Physical protection, |
|   | 1 ➤ Protective clothing |
|   | ► Other. Specify: |
|   | ► Don’t know |

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
*(three choices admitted)*

|   | 1 ➤ Observer |
|   | 1 ➤ Influencer |
|   | ► Programme evaluator expectations; |
|   | ► Project evaluator |
|   | ► Actor of research |
|   | ► User of research |
|   | ► Commissioner of research |
|   | 1 ➤ Disseminator |
|   | ► Other. Specify: |
|   | ► None of them |
|   | ► Don’t know |

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

|   | ➤ Yes |
|   | ➤ No |
|   | 1 ➤ Don’t know |

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

|   | 1 ➤ Yes |
|   | ➤ No |
|   | ➤ Don’t know |

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

|   | 1 ➤ Yes |
|   | ➤ No |
|   | ➤ Don’t know |
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
*(three choices admitted)*

### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other. Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>ActiveWatch: Monitoring Media Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Anonymised

Framework interview ENNA members recommendation

Web survey completed? yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)
1 At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
1 At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
Less than 10
Between 10-25
Between 25-50
Between 50-100
More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
Less than 50
Between 50-100
Between 100-500
Between 500-5000
More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)
1 Commonly associated with security concerns
1 Indirectly associated with security concerns
1 Commonly associated with research issues
1 Indirectly associated with research issues
Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
Less than 100.00€
Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other concerns.</td>
<td>Specify: illegal trafficking, fight crime, human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very usual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: everything that is connected with the aspects mentioned
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research research);
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- ▶ Staff structure /size  
  1  
- ▶ CSO mandates / priorities  
  1  
- ▶ Inappropriate staff skills
- ▶ Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- ▶ Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- ▶ Others. Specify: budget/cofunding

**External barriers**

- ▶ Lack of interest in civil society  
  1  
- ▶ Complexity of the environment to intervene
- ▶ Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- ▶ Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- ▶ Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- 1  
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- 1  
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO  
  1  
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders  
  1  
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:  
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Legal Center for the Protection of Human Rights and the Environment of Slovenia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised |

Framework interview | ENNA network recommendation

Web survey completed? | yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...
Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs? (Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns? (Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO (Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify: human rights, legal aspects related to env,

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-terror intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management/civil protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify:

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: *(three choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme evaluator expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify:

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? *(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? *(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO? (three choices admitted)

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others. Specify: co-funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Plötzlich(Suddendly) Blackout, Austria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High especially thru his job

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- Is part of an security research project "Blackout2"
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
- Regional/local

Note: Research is becoming bigger Switzerland Germany --> topic of the p
### 2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?

*Two choices admitted*

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

### 2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

### 2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

### 2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?

*Several choices admitted*

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

### 2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
- Does not have a budget

### 3. Specific activity of a CSO

*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*

#### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

Specify: Blackout
the energy transitions need to work

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

before people and stakeholders/respondents/security institutions were society is not yet familiar with the topic (or not enough) t

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know

3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation, 
- Maritime, 
- Borders, 
- Infrastructure protection; 
- Counter-terror intelligence, 
- Crisis management/civil protection, 
- Physical protection, 
- Protective clothing 
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: 
(three choices admitted)

- Observer 
- Influencer 
- Programme evaluator 
- Project evaluator (also looked at basic law, what is defined what is missing) 
- Actor of research 
- User of research 
- Commissioner of research 
- Disseminator 
- Other. Specify 
- None of them 
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know 

Security research usually is organized by the state, CSOs need to prove their competence more than others, this is because they cannot retrace how the CSOs earned their reputation.

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? 
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know 

Financial disadvantages, need to invest their own capital, Organizational disadvantages—missing resources,

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes 
- No 
- Don’t know 

Practical point of view is taken into account, Point of view of the society is taken into account, This would mean research is not looking at topics

4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify: financial barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify: Acceptance/ staying power/ administrative barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5. Additional aspects

### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Zivilgesellschaftliche Plattform Forschungswend, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group/s (pre-defined list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

Web survey completed?

---

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

1 - Low

3 - Medium

5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1 - Professional activity in research/teaching

- Intellectual curiosity, hobby

- Societal and/or ethical concerns

- Political concerns

- No particular interest

- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is...

Elected manager (not staff)
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
- Regional/local
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health risks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental risks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace in the world</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual civil rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify:

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very usual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: (three choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

#### 4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Three choices admitted)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request from SR actors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer - FPH, France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/s (pre-defined list)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework interview</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web survey completed?</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

- Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns.
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify
- None of them
- Don’t know
- Advocate

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? (Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

**5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO**

1. The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole  
1. The activity reflects the position only a part  
1. The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved  
1. Don’t know

**5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs**

1. The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders  
1. The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders  
1. Don’t know

**5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement**

1. Larger societal impact  
1. Internal demand of members in the CSO  
1. Programme/funding availability  
1. Collaboration with other stakeholders  
1. Collaboration with other CSOs  
1. Collaboration with government  
1. Other Specify:  
1. Don’t know

**5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation**

1. Ethical obligation  
1. Mandate from the statutes  
1. Bottom-up demand from the CSO members  
1. Interpretation of civil society demands  
1. Request from other CSOs
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Johanniter-Unfall-Hilfe e.V., Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web survey completed?</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security** issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **research** issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to **security research** issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity

*Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience*

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: Non-Profit Organisation

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs? (Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000 (more than 1,30000)

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns? (Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.00€ and 250.00€
- Between 250.00€ and 1.000.00€
- Between 1.000.00€ and 5.000.00€
- More than 5.000.00€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

|   | Health risks | Environmental risks | Peace in the world | Privacy | Cybersecurity | Individual civil rights | Minority’s rights | Other concerns.
Specify: civil protection, disater risk reduction | No direct concern | Don’t know |
|---|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------|

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes since 1952</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
► Aviation,
► Maritime,
► Borders,
1 ► Infrastructure protection; (social systems like hospitals, kindergarten
► Counter-terror intelligence,
1 ► Crisis management/civil protection,
► Physical protection,
► Protective clothing
► Other. Specify:
► Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
► Observer
1 ► Influencer
► Programme evaluator
► Project evaluator
► Actor of research
► User of research
► Commissioner of research
► Disseminator
► Other. Specify:
► None of them
► Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement
4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
► Yes
1 ► No
► Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
1 ► Yes
► No
► Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
1 ► Yes
► No
► Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

Internal barriers

[ ] ► Staff structure / size
[ ] ► CSO mandates / priorities
[ ] ► Inappropriate staff skills
[ ] ► Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
[ ] ► Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
[ ] ► Others. Specify:

External barriers

[ ] ► Lack of interest in civil society
[ ] ► Complexity of the environment to intervene
[ ] ► Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
[ ] ► Poor relationship with other stakeholders
[ ] ► Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

[ ] The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
[ ] The activity reflects the position only a part
[ ] The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
[ ] Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

[ ] The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
[ ] The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
[ ] Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

[ ] Larger societal impact
[ ] Internal demand of members in the CSO
[ ] Programme/funding availability
[ ] Collaboration with other stakeholders
[ ] Collaboration with other CSOs
[ ] Collaboration with government
[ ] Other Specify:
[ ] Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

[ ] Ethical obligation
[ ] Mandate from the statutes
[ ] Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
[ ] Interpretation of civil society demands
[ ] Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Involve, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

Web survey completed?

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others
1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...

- Elected manager (not staff)
- Staff
- Volunteer / active member
- Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- Irrelevant
- Other. Specify:

1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or 'Peace' NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
► At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
► At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
► Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
► Less than 10
► Between 10-25
► Between 25-50
► Between 50-100
► More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
► Less than 50
► Between 50-100
► Between 100-500
► Between 500-5000
► More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
► Commonly associated with security concerns
► Indirectly associated with security concerns
► Commonly associated with research issues
► Indirectly associated with research issues
► Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
► Less than 100.00€
► Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
► Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
► Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
► More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes indirectly
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research? (Several choices admitted)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify:
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology(ies) related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing

1. Other. Specify: DAN Database

- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator

1. Other. Specify: Expert

- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

1. Yes

- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

1. Yes

- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1. Yes

- No
- Don’t know
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

#### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size <strong>biggerst problem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Others. Specify: Network is missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Specify: supporting engagement
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group/s (pre-defined list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework interview</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Web survey completed? 'no

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
_Two choices admitted_
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)  
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)  
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?  
- Less than 10  
- Between 10-25  
- Between 25-50  
- Between 50-100  
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?  
- Less than 50  
- Between 50-100  
- Between 100-500  
- Between 500-5000  
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
_Several choices admitted_
- Commonly associated with security concerns  
- Indirectly associated with security concerns  
- Commonly associated with research issues  
- Indirectly associated with research issues  
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?  
- Less than 100.00€  
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€  
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€  
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€  
- More than 5.000.000€  
Interviewee didn’t know

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
_Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience_
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?  
(*Several choices admitted*)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify: & insecurity
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?  
(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,  
- Maritime,  
- Borders,  
- Infrastructure protection;  
- Counter-terror intelligence,  
- Crisis management/civil protection,  
- Physical protection,  
- Protective clothing

1. Other. Specify: Development of platform

2. Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:  
(three choices admitted)

- Observer  
- Influencer  
- Programme evaluator  
- Project evaluator  

1. Actor of research  
- User of research  
- Commissioner of research  
- Disseminator  

1. Other. Specify:  

2. None of them  
3. Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?  
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

- 1. **Staff structure / size**
- 1. **CSO mandates / priorities**
- **Inappropriate staff skills**
- **Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators**
- **Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern**
- **Others. Specify:**

**External barriers**

- **Lack of interest in civil society**
- **Complexity of the environment to intervene**
- **Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels**
- **Poor relationship with other stakeholders**
- **Others. Specify:**

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- 1. Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- 1. Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- 1. Larger societal impact
- 1. Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- 1. Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- **Other Specify:**
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reques from public institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview

Web survey completed? No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

1 - Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000
- Unknown / uncompleted

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
- Don’t know

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify: Extremism
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

(Several choices admitted)

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing

1 Other. Specify: Technology enabled learning
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

(Three choices admitted)

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator

1 Other. Specify: Project lead, project partner, network leader
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)

1 Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))?

1 Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1 Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
(three choices admitted)

Internal barriers
- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

External barriers
- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify: Projects led by a select few

5. Additional aspects
5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO
- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs
- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement
- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify:
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation
- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requests from public institutions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know: 1
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact | Anonymised

Framework interview

Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1. The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify: Disaster management
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€
- Don’t know / uncompleted

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

(Several choices admitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

*(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research research);
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify:
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?

(three choices admitted)

Internal barriers

- Staff structure / size
- CSO mandates / priorities
- Inappropriate staff skills
- Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators
- Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern
- Others. Specify:

External barriers

- Lack of interest in civil society
- Complexity of the environment to intervene
- Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels
- Poor relationship with other stakeholders
- Others. Specify:

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

- The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole
- The activity reflects the position only a part
- The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved
- Don’t know

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

- The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders
- The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders
- Don’t know

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

- Larger societal impact
- Internal demand of members in the CSO
- Programme/funding availability
- Collaboration with other stakeholders
- Collaboration with other CSOs
- Collaboration with government
- Other Specify: Want to understand and develop useful solutions
- Don’t know

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

- Ethical obligation
- Mandate from the statutes
- Bottom-up demand from the CSO members
- Interpretation of civil society demands
- Request from other CSOs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request from public institutions</th>
<th>Request from SR actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>research directly in the CSO’s field of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify: research directly in the CSO’s field of activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>research directly in the CSO’s field of activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview: Cordis database, EU-security funded research

Web survey completed?: No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

*Low 1 points - Expert 5 points*

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?  
(Two choices admitted)

1. At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
2. At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

1. Less than 10
2. Between 10-25
3. Between 25-50
4. Between 50-100
5. More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

1. Less than 50
2. Between 50-100
3. Between 100-500
4. Between 500-1000
5. More than 1000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?  
(Several choices admitted)

1. Commonly associated with security concerns
2. Indirectly associated with security concerns
3. Commonly associated with research issues
4. Indirectly associated with research issues
5. Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

1. Less than 100.00€
2. Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
3. Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
4. Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
5. More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO  
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health risks</th>
<th>Environmental risks</th>
<th>Peace in the world</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Individual civil rights</th>
<th>Minority’s rights</th>
<th>Other concerns.</th>
<th>No direct concern</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very usual</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International level</th>
<th>European level</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Regional/local level</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?
(Several choices admitted)
- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify: 
- Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:
(three choices admitted)
- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: Partner
- None of them
- Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?
(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)?)
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
(*three choices admitted*)

**Internal barriers**

| 1 ▶ | Staff structure / size |
| 1 ▶ | CSO mandates / priorities |
| ▶ | Inappropriate staff skills |
| ▶ | Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators |
| 1 ▶ | Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern |
| ▶ | Others. Specify: |

**External barriers**

| ▶ | Lack of interest in civil society |
| 1 ▶ | Complexity of the environment to intervene |
| ▶ | Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels |
| ▶ | Poor relationship with other stakeholders |
| ▶ | Others. Specify: |

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

| ▶ | The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole |
| ▶ | The activity reflects the position only a part |
| ▶ | The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved |
| 1 ▶ | Don’t know |

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

| 1 ▶ | The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders |
| ▶ | The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders |
| ▶ | Don’t know |

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

| ▶ | Larger societal impact |
| ▶ | Internal demand of members in the CSO |
| ▶ | Programme/funding availability |
| ▶ | Collaboration with other stakeholders |
| ▶ | Collaboration with other CSOs |
| ▶ | Collaboration with government |
| 1 ▶ | Other Specify: | Want to develop useful solutions |
| ▶ | Don’t know |

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| ▶ | Ethical obligation |
| ▶ | Mandate from the statutes |
| ▶ | Bottom-up demand from the CSO members |
| ▶ | Interpretation of civil society demands |
| ▶ | Request from other CSOs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact | Anonymised |

Framework interview Replied to CSO survey

Web survey completed? Yes

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security issues is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Level of familiarization or experience in relation to security research issues is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional activity in research/teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual curiosity, hobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal and/or ethical concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...

- Less than one year
- Between 1-2 years
- Between 3-5 years
- Between 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...

- Very high. It is a daily environment
- High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

2. CSO identity

(O only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)

2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?

- Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- Human rights group or network
- Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- Professional association or group
- Student group
- Trade union and employers’ organization
- Academic association or network
- Women’s organization
- Faith-based organization
- Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- Other. Specify:
- Don’t know

2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?

- International
- European
- National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)
- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?
- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?
- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500- 5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)
- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?
- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?
(Several choices admitted)
- Health risks
- Environmental risks
- Peace in the world
- Privacy
- Cybersecurity
- Individual civil rights
- Minority’s rights
- Other concerns. Specify: Trafficking of people, violence at school
- No direct concern
- Don’t know

3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?
- Yes
- No

3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been ...
- Very usual
- Usual
- Occasional
- Rare
- Don’t know

3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...
- International level
- European level
- National level
- Regional/local level
- Don’t know
### 3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO?

*Several choices admitted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-terror intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis management/civil protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify Organised crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been:

*Three choices admitted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme evaluator expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify Supports young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Opinion about CSO involvement

#### 4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages?

*Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?  
*(three choices admitted)*

#### Internal barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure /size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External barriers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Additional aspects

#### 5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4 If 'internal demand of members in the CSO' in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; surname</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Anonymised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group/s (pre-defined list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Administrat.</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Anonymised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Framework interview | Besecure FP7 project
Web survey completed? | No

1. Implication and knowledge

1.1 Level of familiarity or experience in relation to security issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.2 Level of familiarity or experience in relation to research issues in general is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.3 Level of familiarity or experience in relation to security research issues is...

Low 1 points - Expert 5 points

- 1 - Low
- 3 - Medium
- 5 - High

1.4 Familiarization or experience on research issues is primarily related to...

- Professional activity in research/teaching
- Intellectual curiosity, hobby
- Societal and/or ethical concerns
- Political concerns
- No particular interest
- Others

1.5 Latest position in the CSO is as...
### 1. Elected manager (not staff)
- [ ] Staff
- [ ] Volunteer / active member
- [ ] Other type of collaborator (disseminator, donor, etc.)
- [ ] Participant at the activities / follower of their positions
- [ ] Irrelevant
- [ ] Other. Specify:

### 1.6 The interviewee is involved in the CSO for...
- [ ] Less than one year
- [ ] Between 1-2 years
- [ ] Between 3-5 years
- [ ] Between 5-10 years
- [ ] More than 10 years

### 1.7 The knowledge of the CSO environment by the interviewee is...
- [ ] Very high. It is a daily environment
- [ ] High. It is a regular (weekly or monthly) environment
- [ ] Medium. It is an occasional environment (several times in a year)
- [ ] Low. It is a very occasional environment (several times in the last years)
- [ ] Very low. My contact is rare or non-existent.

### 2. CSO identity
*(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)*

#### 2.1 What type of profile respond better to the CSO?
- [ ] Community-based or neighbourhood organization or group
- [ ] Development or ‘Peace’ NGO
- [ ] Human rights group or network
- [ ] Advocacy organization or group (i.e. campaign or public interest group)
- [ ] Lobby group (pressure group, private & business interest group)
- [ ] Network or support group devoted to societal empowerment
- [ ] Policy research institute, think tank or security studies institute
- [ ] Professional association or group
- [ ] Student group
- [ ] Trade union and employers’ organization
- [ ] Academic association or network
- [ ] Women’s organization
- [ ] Faith-based organization
- [ ] Non-operational charitable organization (i.e. grantmaking foundation)
- [ ] Other. Specify:
- [ ] Don’t know

#### 2.2 What type of geographic outreach has the CSO?
- [ ] International
- [ ] European
- [ ] National
2.3 Does the CSO have any interrelation with other CSOs?
(Two choices admitted)

- At smaller level (i.e. the CSO collaborates with other CSOs locally based)
- At bigger level (i.e. the CSO is member of an umbrella federating CSOs)
- Don’t know

2.4 How many employees has the CSO?

- Less than 10
- Between 10-25
- Between 25-50
- Between 50-100
- More than 100

2.5 How many members/friends has the CSO?

- Less than 50
- Between 50-100
- Between 100-500
- Between 500-5000
- More than 5000

2.6 How is the CSO associated with research and/or security concerns?
(Several choices admitted)

- Commonly associated with security concerns
- Indirectly associated with security concerns
- Commonly associated with research issues
- Indirectly associated with research issues
- Don’t know

2.7 How much budget is available for the CSO by year?

- Less than 100.00€
- Between 100.000€ and 250.000€
- Between 250.000€ and 1.000.000€
- Between 1.000.000€ and 5.000.000€
- More than 5.000.000€

3. Specific activity of a CSO
(Only when the interviewee can describe a particular experience)
### 3.1 Is the CSO concerned in security research related aspects?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [x] Don’t know

### 3.2 In which aspects is the CSO concerned at security research?

*(Several choices admitted)*

- [x] Health risks
- [x] Environmental risks
- [x] Peace in the world
- [x] Privacy
- [x] Cybersecurity
- [x] Individual civil rights
- [x] Minority’s rights
- [ ] Other concerns. 
  - Specify: Measurement of security
- [ ] No direct concern
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.3 Has the CSO been involved in any activity related during the last six years?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.4 If yes in 3.3, has the interviewee been directly involved in the activity?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

### 3.5 If yes in 3.3, this activity of the CSO in security research issues has been …

- [ ] Very usual
- [x] Usual
- [ ] Occasional
- [ ] Rare
- [ ] Don’t know

### 3.6 If yes in 3.3, this activity has taken place at...

- [ ] International level
- [x] European level
- [ ] National level
- [ ] Regional/local level
- [ ] Don’t know
3.7 Which technology/ies related to security arise more concerns to the CSO? *(Several choices admitted)*

- Aviation,
- Maritime,
- Borders,
- Infrastructure protection;
- Counter-terror intelligence,
- Crisis management/civil protection,
- Physical protection,
- Protective clothing
- Other. Specify:

1. Don’t know

3.8 The main roles played by the CSO have been: *(three choices admitted)*

- Observer
- Influencer
- Programme evaluator
- Expectations;
- Project evaluator
- Actor of research
- User of research
- Commissioner of research
- Disseminator
- Other. Specify: Partner or Co-ordinator

1. None of them
2. Don’t know

4. Opinion about CSO involvement

4.1 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? *(When dealing with security issues in comparison with other research fields)*

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

4.2 Do you think CSOs in general have to face specific disadvantages? *(Compared with other stakeholders involved (industry, researchers, academia, etc.))*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know

4.3 Do you think CSOs have to be more involved than they are now?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know
4.4 What type of barriers do you see for a hypothetical CSO?
*(three choices admitted)*

**Internal barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff structure / size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO mandates / priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inappropriate staff skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor involvement of the members and other collaborators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate plan of activities to generate interest / transmit concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External barriers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of interest in civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity of the environment to intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other CSOs at different territorial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor relationship with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others. Specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Additional aspects

5.1 Assessment about the representativeness of the activity carried out by the CSO

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of the CSO as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position only a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflect the position of those individuals directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Assessment about the CSO role in relation to other stakeholders including other CSOs

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity reflects the position of a majority of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The activity only reflects a part of the position of the stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Reasons behind the CSO involvement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger societal impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal demand of members in the CSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme/funding availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration with government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 If ‘internal demand of members in the CSO’ in 5.3, type of motivation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandate from the statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up demand from the CSO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of civil society demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request from other CSOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from public institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests from SR actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify: [ ]