SecurePART Project

Objective FP7- SEC-2013.7.3.1
Support Action
Increasing the engagement of civil society in security research
Project Number: 608039

D6.7. Executive summary of the project's final report

Version 0.2

20 April 2016

1. Change Control

1.1. Document Properties

Deliverable No.		D6.7	
Work Package No	WP6	Work Package Title	Dissemination
Author/s		Alexandre Almeida (LOBA), Georgios Kolliarakis (GUF), Jean Cornier (VDL), Elizabeth Isaacs (BANTEC), Maider Goñi (BANTEC), Caroline Davey (SAL), Frank Balzer (NEXUS), Christoph Henseler (NEXUS), Denisa Ionescu (ENNA)	
Reviewer		Adelino Silva	
Name		Executive summary of the project's final report	
Date		29 April 2016	
Dissemination Level		PU	

1.2. Revision History

Version	Date	Comments
0.1	5 April 2016	0.1. - Initial Version
0.2	27 April 2016	0.2 – Inputs from partners

2. Contents

3. Executive Summary

The SecurePART - Increasing the engagement of civil society in security research has a duration of 24 months and started in May 2014. The consortium is made up of 7 partners from 5 different countries: Spain, Germany, Belgium, United Kingdom and Portugal. The consortium, led by Bantec (SP) has the following partners: vdLconsult (DE); ENNA (BE); nexus institute (DE); Goethe University (DE); University of Salford (UK); LOBA (PT). This SecurePART team is made up by independent, specialized social research centres and consultancies (specialised in policy analysis, citizen engagement and social marketing) ensuring a neutral approach. Extensive interaction with CSOs was ensured by the EU Network of CSOs (ENNA) that facilitated large consultations with their representatives and the multiplying effect of communication and dissemination actions planned.

The project was organised into seven individual work packages, out of which five are related to supporting activities, one related to dissemination activities and one related to management. Project activities included: Analysis and Studies; Reviews on other non-security research who have a similar problem of acceptance by the society ; Societal & CSO analyses; Development of communication plan about potential benefits of security research activities; Strategy for increasing CSO participation & Action plan.

The project also included the constitution and management Stakeholders Board with the following distinguished members:

- Tom Sorell
- Ineke Malsh
- Dr. Walter Peissl
- Dr Henk Mulder
- Christian Sommade
- Hugo Rosemont
- Ulrich Dünnes
- Mirko Schwärzel
- Hendrik Keersmaekers
- Sadhbh McCarthy

4. Project Context and Objectives

4.1. Context

The SecurePART project relates to the issues addressed by the Security Call in Topic SEC-2013.7.3.1: Increasing the engagement of civil society in security research – Coordination and Support Action (Supporting Action).

SecurePART is a project which explored ways to strengthen the participation of civil society organisations (CSOs) within the European Security Research programme. SecurePART was funded by EU Security Research Programme, but it also has strong links to two other research domains within the EU research Framework Programme: "Europe in a changing world - Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies"; and the cross-cutting research area "Science with and for Society".

The Horizon 2020 Societal Challenge "Secure societies – Protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens" currently involves research in four broad areas: Crisis management and resilience against disasters; organised crime; counter-terrorism, and anti-radicalisation; border control and management; and cybersecurity. Most crucially, security research can be taken to be a proactive form of security policy, creating a pool of potential measures and solutions to address current and future challenges in the increasingly important and contentious policy field of public security.

In SecurePART we pursued a multi-stakeholder-governance approach with regard to the ESRP. Besides CSOs from a variety of sectors and regions, with different degrees of familiarity with security research, we explored the views and actions of other research actors from academia, industry and SMEs, but also policy makers from member states, representatives from National Contact Points for EU research, officers from the European Commission with relevant dossiers, as well as officers from the Research Executive Agency. We have scoped other research fields such as genetic technology or nano-technology which have generated controversies in society for stakeholder engagement practices.

After analysing the institutional context of relevant research and engagement policies, we applied a supply-demand ("push-pull") logic in order to find out about existing, missing or untapped opportunity structures for CSO engagement in the ESRP, but also about capacities and incentives for CSOs and other research actors to come together in a productive manner. This led us to conduct a feasibility/desirability check of all involved stakeholders in order to identify barriers arising from their capacity and willingness to engage CSOs.

4.2. Objetives

Technological research and innovation, despite its advantages for the European market and economy, is not a sufficient solution to comprehensive security problems faced by contemporary European societies; Policies on civil security, and also research under Horizon 2020, starting with the present FP7 call, should enhance social innovation mechanisms, as suggested at the EC

workshop in June 2011 in Oslo (Security Research and Europe's Societal Challenges: What do citizens expect?), but also in the 2011 EC/ERA report on the Common Strategic Framework for Research and Innovation (Inclusive, Innovative, and Secure Societies Challenge).

Consequently, the main goal of the SecurePART project was to contribute to stronger engagement with and involvement of civil society organisations and their advocates in EU security research in order to advance the dimension of non-technological, social innovation. SecurePART established as objectives to review and analyse the status of the civil society involvement both in security and other sectors in order to define a strategy & action plan to increase its engagement and influence.

In order to do so we aimed our efforts to reach the following strategic objectives:

1. Understanding the status quo about CSOs participation;

2. Helping CSOs to cope with the increasing complexity of security research;

3. Promoting collaboration links among CSOs and with the rest of stakeholders;

4. Defining a strategy and produce an action plan with action steps how to increase CSO participation in both the shaping and the implementation of security research.

By scrutinising these strategic objectives, the SecurePART specific objectives were divided in 3 different sets, namely:

1. **Analyses and studies**

    1.1.   Study about current FP7 Projects CSOs involvement;

    1.2.   Intra CSO analysis: Human, organisational, social and financial empowerment and effectiveness of actions;

    1.3.   Inter CSOs analysis: different collaborative scenarios should be envisaged;

    1.4.   Trans CSO analysis: connection of CSOs with other key stakeholders;

    1.5.   Reviews on other non-security research who have a similar problem of acceptance by the society.

2. **Actions for increasing the engagement of CSOs in security research**

    2.1.   Connect CSOs to other key stakeholders (researchers, suppliers, authorities, end users);

    2.2.   Motivate and communicate stakeholders towards multilateral collaboration and coordination with CSOs;

    2.3.   Enabling CSOs to contribute to public debate and action for security research development through long-term partnerships;

    2.4.   Communication plan addressed to CSOs about potential benefits of security research activities;

    2.5.   Adoption of a Stakeholders Board to review and comment the Action Plan for

compliance with citizen's demands.

3. <u>**Future strategy & action plan**</u>

3.1. Recommendations on how to achieving a greater engagement with and involvement of civil society organisations and their advocates in EU security research in the future;

3.2. Conceptualize a foresight process resulting in the implementation of a structuring process.

5. Work performed and the main results achieved

The SecurePART project implements 3 main activities as described in the list below:

Activity 1 - Analysis and Studies

1. *Analyse the content and status of FP7 security research projects*

The project consortium made desk research of CSOs involvement in FP7 projects, based on the 6 different roles they can play: policy observers, project evaluators, programme agenda influencers, performers of projects, commissioners of research and disseminators;

Associated public deliverables (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html):

D1.2 - Background Report

D1.5 - Interviews report

D1.6 - Six case studies

D1.7 - Statistical analysis report

D1.8 - SWOT analysis report

D1.9 - Interview guide

D1.10 - Conclusions report

What have we researched and what do we know about CSO involvement in Security Research?

CSOs have often multiple personalities due to the different roles they are called to perform under varying circumstances, whenever they interact with other stakeholders. This also applies to their engagement in European security research. CSOs have dramatically grown in number and have evolved out of their classical role by transforming themselves, as societal challenges and political contexts of action have changed in the past couple of years. Most generic, "fuzzy" definitions of CSOs, used by public policy actors nowadays, are inclusive, yet they do not help discern "real", public-interest CSOs from organizations and associations with a particularistic, for-profit agenda.

Narrow definitions, on the other hand, may be better at the operative policy level, when it comes to selecting relevant CSOs for consultations, project funding, etc., but they create many deviations from the rule, and a lot of exclusion of organizations which do not completely correspond to the ideal core.

Size and resources of CSOs

Most of the selected CSOs for the study are small or even very small (micro), as regards number of employees and budget. CSOs with more than 100 employees and 5M€ are a minority in Europe.

Most of the CSOs that are involved in security research are medium or large organizations with branches at international, European, national and also at regional or local level. _is is why; depending on the focus of activity or project where they are working, they can involve any of the following specific levels.

CSOs do not have sufficient resources to be committed to activities that are outside of the main aim of the organization. Only large CSOs, with an international or European focus, have enough resources or specific units devoted to research activities. But there are exceptions, as there are a few very small and small CSOs with European activity focused on research.

Interest of CSOs in security research

Interests of CSOs: they are strongly related to ethical and societal dimensions of security research. Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-threats for CSO engagement in security research: the analysis of CSOs with regard to the security research landscape has shown that CSOs' strengths are their "hands-on" style and their understanding of societal and practical issues "on the ground". In the security Science & Technology context, this endows CSOs with the capacity to be trusted "brokers" and "facilitators", with the potential to raise trust among researchers, society, and public policy makers. Therefore, their input can be invaluable in bridging security R&D with societal needs and ethical concerns of citizens. This untapped potential can under certain circumstances open windows for them to participate, and also help disseminate and increase the value of research results, potentially enhancing their uptake. However, if they are not willing or lack the resources to participate in dialogue with other stakeholders, or find common denominators in their agenda and that of security research, then their relevance for the ESRP and their capacity to make a useful contribution will probably decline.

Where CSOs would like to be involved

The project has detected a wide spectrum of fields and technologies where CSOs might be involved: First 'individual civil rights' followed by 'minority's rights', 'privacy', 'environmental risks', 'cybersecurity' or 'health risks'. In line with the security research fields most interesting to CSOs, crisis management is by large, the most important, followed by infrastructure protection, counter-terror, physical protection and borders.

When an how the involvement of CSOs in security research took place

The analysis has allowed us to understand the scope and involvement of CSOs in security research during the last 6 years and the periodicity or frequency of their activity in this matter. 54% of the activities in security research where CSOs that had a European background, 22% of them were at a national level, 20% at an international level, and 4% at a regional or local level. We have concluded that 69% of CSOs had direct involvement in this activity and 31% had an indirect relationship with SR.

The more usual roles played by CSOs

They are, by order or frequency: observer, actor of research, disseminator of research results, influencer. Also, a small percentage have worked as users of the research, project evaluators, program evaluator or commissioner of research.

Internal and external barriers faced by CSOs

Internal barriers have been identified from the analysis: CSOs have more difficulty to be involved in security research according to – by order - staff structure or size of the CSO, CSOs mandates or priorities, inappropriate staff skills, poor involvement of the members and other collaborators and inappropriate plan of the activities to generate interest.

On the institutional side, the rather low compatibility between CSOs' agendas and missions results in mutual ignorance and lack of interest. While the ESRP and its research calls have a dominant high-tech industrial character, aimed to strengthen the marketing of security technologies, most CSOs care about issues of civil and minority rights. Such agendas could, however, become more compatible in the future.

2. *Reviews on other non-security research who have a similar problem of acceptance by the society*

Analyse best practice not only in the Security Sector but also in other sectors that has a similar problem of acceptance by the society, like the Chemical technology industry, and more actual the Nano-technology or Genetic-technology.

Controversial technologies have one feature in common they lack transparency vis-á-vis the civil society. This contributes considerably to the rejection of critical technologies. In order to improve this, it needs tools/methods to make technologies tranparent and:

- to make them understandable
- to demonstrate their function
- to demonstrate their benefits
- to prepare their utilisation.

By implementing these tools feedback is received from the civil society regarding their demands. **For the objective of SecurePART to increase the CSO participation in security research the proposed tools and methods are a complementary approach to empowering the CSOs.** The proposed tools and methods have the potential to be a key element to support the objective "Strengthen transparency, fairness, and accountability".
It is therefore recommended to make the tools:

- Consensus Conferences
- Demonstration Projects
- Participatory Technology Assessment
- Public Days

an integrated part of the strategy for increasing CSO participation in security research.

Associated are the following deliverables:
D 2.1 Report on Technology Fields Selection
D 2.3 Report on selected method and application scenario to the security research field
D 2.7 Recommendations report for WP5 input.

3.	*Societal & CSO analyses*

Analyse the Intra, Inter and Trans CSO status. A model of public policy stakeholder management along criteria of high/low power and high/low relevance will identify converging or diverging:

(a) Framings and understandings of security problems;

(b) Resources available; Fears, needs and vulnerabilities;

(c) Ethical aspects of Security and Cultural values in Europe

Associated public deliverables (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html):

D3.1 - Report on CSOs internal capacities

D3.2 - Report on the collaborative links among CSOs

D3.3 - Matrix of CSOs and other stakeholders' perception and expectations

Main results achieved

DEFINITION, CATEGORIES and ROLES of CSOs

According to the European Commission, civil society encompasses trade unions and employers' organisations ("social partners"), non-governmental organisations, professional associations, charities, grass-roots organisations, and organisations that involve citizens in local and municipal life, including churches and religious communities. These are supposed to lend a voice to the needs of all citizens, and provide a communication channel for them to policy makers. Civil Society Organisations are broadly defined as:

"… all non-state, not-for-profit structures, non-partisan and nonviolent, through which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals, whether political, cultural, social or economic." (European Commission (2012), *The Roots of Democracy and Sustainable Development. Europe's Engagement with Civil Society in External Relations,* Brussels, 12/9/2012. COM(2012) 492 final)

A preliminary analysis of the CORDIS database conducted by SecurePART helped discern the following categories of CSOs, many of which are practitioners of security provision:

- Medical disaster first aid/relief associations;

- Emergency Services (Fire brigades & rescue services;

- Transport associations & passenger rights NGOs;

- Community & neighbourhood integration associations;

- Human/civil rights associations;

- ICT/cyber liberties & data protection organisations;

- Climate change and environmental organizations;

- Development cooperation organizations;

- Think Tanks & foundations;

- Science dissemination organisations

Many of the above categories contain hybrid organisations, which are on the border between public administration, research organisations, or small enterprises. Yet a major challenge is the

lack of a clear, jointly shared and legally binding definition of what is a CSO.

CSOs are under-represented within EU security research projects. The SecurePART coding in the CORDIS database resulted in an approximate percentage of 4% of CSOs out of ca. 2,000 total beneficiaries. However, the ex-post evaluation of FP7 Security theme (2015) did not differentiate among CSOs and other organisations, and CSOs necessarily fell into the category "Other", accounting for around 3% of total participations.

CSOs have already undertaken a number of roles within security research with different intensity in terms of format, and different goals, while they still aspire to undertake roles with more influence:

1. *Observers:* CSOs get information on H2020 programme at info days, project and policy conferences;

2. *Advisors:* CSOs are invited to become members in external advisory boards during the project implementation phase;

3. *Actors of research*: CSOs participate in research as members of a project consortium, often as disseminators raising awareness to key target groups:

4. *Project evaluators & reviewers*: CSOs are invited by the EC services as external experts to conduct evaluations and reviews;

5. *SR agenda consultants*: CSOs are consulted during the drafting of the future SR programme agenda;

6. *Commissioners of research*: CSOs formulate research calls with a strong SR relevance

THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT FOR CSO ENGAGEMENT IN RESEARCH:

Since the launch of the Lisbon Treaty societal engagement in policy making in general, and in S&T research is pursued by the EU for both for democratic reasons, and for instrumental reasons – engagement improves the research results and the relevance of policies by including societal knowledge, ideas and capacities in research and increasing the knowledge base for policy making. In contentious and sensitive research fields, such as that of security, compliance with the Treaty of Fundamental Rights is essential. -ree funding lines have been identified, which provide access to CSOs to research funding in the FP7/Horizon 2020 programmes: Priority III "Societal challenges", which includes seven thematic priorities, one of them being the Work Programme "Secure societies", as well as one of its two specific objectives, the objective V "Science with and for Society". A general dedicated funding scheme "Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups – Civil Society Organisations" (BSG-CSO) had been also introduced in FP7. -ere have been many indications for optimism about the degree and the breadth of engagement of CSOs in most areas, something which applies only partially to the ESRP. CSOs are mostly invited for their expertise on the ground, and for their role as brokers and disseminators of results, but less as active influencers, designers, or implementers of the (security) research agenda.

THE STAKEHOLDER ENVIRONMENT IN THE EUROPEAN SECURITY RESEARCH:

Based upon surveys and data evaluations, stakeholder categories and types, such as social and human scientists, security industry actors/technology developers, end-users, security policy

makers, and civil society representatives have been distinguished for analytical reasons as distinct types of actors. -e study of their "master frames", interests, goals and concerns with security research revealed some common ground, but also a lot of divergence and some deep cleavages. Most interesting thereby is the broad and fuzzy category of end-users, which often comprises CSOs, public authorities, and private companies of security provision. -at notwithstanding, there is a huge discrepancy between CSO and other stakeholders' participation in security research project consortia, which amounts to less than 5%. -e examination of the role of CSOs within consultation forums and ad-hoc expert groups has shown very limited presence, and a similar picture results out of the comparison of stakeholders with regard to the resources received from the ESRP. -is analysis provided the background for a multi-stakeholder power/interest matrix, which attempted to position CSOs in relation with other stakeholders with regard to their influence on the ESRP. While RTOs and big security industry along SMEs have been the strongest profit and leverage with the security programme, public authorities and universities seem to be left behind, while CSOs play a negligible role, also in the cloak of end-users. -is matrix provided a first mapping of CSOs in relation to other key players within the ESRP research environment, which will help at identifying institutional barriers, but also opportunity windows for CSOs, and contribute to strengthening, upstreaming, and streamlining their engagement in security research for mutual benefit.

BARRIERS TO CSO ENGAGEMENT IN THE ESRP

In a series of interviews, online surveys, and an interactive CSO-Stakeholder workshop, SecurePART found out that:

There are CSOs that appear to have an explicit interest in security research and have participated/can participate in research actions. However, more than one third of the interviewed CSOs do not readily recognize much relevance of security research to their activities—at least not at first sight—and therefore do not participate. There is also a considerable proportion among the interviewed CSOs which have an explicit interest in security research, but lack access to research actions. This highlights target groups of CSOs for security research offering an untapped potential. Those that do not yet recognise the relevance of SR could be sensitized and mobilized to participate in future research actions for mutual benefit; Those already willing to participate need better access opportunities.

CSO representatives, from a diverse range of backgrounds, stated that their motivation to participate in EU security research is linked with their activities on the ground, also linked to political, social, and ethical concerns of the citizens.

In general, CSOs are confronted with a series of internal and external barriers when it comes to the European Security Research Programme. CSOs face the challenge of being informed and being visible to other security research actors, link their organisation's mandates with the concrete security research topics, and, not least, employ the appropriate staff to conduct research. What is more, many CSOs seem to be alienated by the predominantly technological focus of the ESRP, as well as deterred by administrative hurdles, and by the poor relationships with other security research actors. Unfortunately, there is a lack of CSO networks in security-relevant fields to promote their agendas at EU level.

At the same time, it is not easy for research administrators at the European Commission to recognise advantages and benefits of CSO engagement in security research actions. The situation may be exacerbated by a tendency amongst project co-ordinators and partners (such as research

and technology organisations, universities, or industry including SMEs) to not include CSOs in their activities, or simply assign them dissemination roles or less-substantial tasks.

A frequent point of resistance toward wide (CSO) participation from the side of industrial developers and commercial service providers is confidentiality about security research outputs fearing about patents and comparative market advantages.

Activity 2 - Increase the engagement of CSOs in security research

4.   Development of communication plan about potential benefits of security research activities

The aim is to bring together stakeholders from both sectors – Civil Society Organizations & security research – to work out a "case for action" highlighting the necessity for the civil society to participate more intensively in the management of crises as well as in the strategic orientation of security research.

Therefore we created a *communication strategy and plan* about potential benefits of security research which was designed to group the communication activities, underlying the connection with CSOs and the awakening of an interest towards security research.This activity included:

- Evaluation of communication actions carried out
- Identification of Good Practices in communicating about security research;
- Communication Plan Design;
- Communication campaign addressed to CSOs.

Associated public deliverables (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html):

D4.2 - Communication materials

D4.4 - Summary of the communication actions carried out

Some Examples (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html):

- Project Flyer for CSOs
- First Period Results
- Guide for Promoters of Communication Activities in the field of Security Research: A special focus on CSOs
- Guide why and how to participate in Horizon 2020 Security Research

Main results achieved

Organize several international events with participants coming from all the sectors / categories of stakeholders involved or possibly interested in ESRP. (the detailed communication actions are presented in Deliverable 4.4; all the events attended by the partners are in Deliverables 6.4 and 6.5)

See the links here and here

Engage and bring forward, through ENNA, but also through the network of its members and partners, various CSOs on the entire period of the project (participants to the interview phase recommended the project to other colleagues / collaborators which, at a later stage, got involved in the events organized by the consortium).

Realize and promote different materials and communication messages addressed to a diverse public (CSOs, Security Research project coordinators, wide public).

For example, the messages promoted on the project's Facebook page.

Activity 3 - Future strategy & action plan

5.   *Strategy for increasing CSO participation & Action plan*

The objective is to learn from the activities/experiences gained during the project in order to draw guidelines and recommendations at EU level.

The action plan will take in consideration how to interconnect/integrate CSOs in decision finding and, progressively, in decision making processes. (Example: one result could be the recommendation within the RoadMap to set up a "living lab" of security researchers and CSOs continuously defining and testing new research results as well as crises management procedures within an ongoing cooperation.)

Associated public deliverables (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html):

D5.1 - Plan for rules of participation of CSOs

D5.2 - Map of stakeholders ranking of values and objectives

D5.3 - Recommendation on permanent institutional set-ups for CSO engagement in Security Research

D5.4 - Foresight Report of CSO participation in Security Research

Main results achieved:

SecurePART Action Plan for strengthening the links between civil society organizations and security reseach

http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html

A set of 4 videos with recommendations for CSO, Project Coordinators, NCPs and European Commission

http://www.securepart.eu/en/gallery.html

Recommendation on permanent institutional set-ups for CSO engagement in Security Research

This study has examined existing set ups in EU for Security Research and institutional and organizational possibilities outside Security Research field, which could be imported to Security Research as reference of CSO involvement. In this regard the study has analysed the Mobilization and Mutual Learning EU projects (precedent and ongoing projects).

It was expected that this study will help on the identification of potential existing set ups as reference models; will Identify formats that are most promising for establishing mutual exchange with CSOs in the context of security research is because of that we analysed MML (Mobilization and Mutual Learning EU projects); and will give us the possibility to suggest tentative key points to be considered when design a platform in SR.

The main aims of the study were to identify existing Multi stakeholder Exchange platforms in EU

involving CSO and determinate how permanent and influence they are. Examined institutional and organizational possibilities outside for SR to identify transferable "good practices" which could be imported to Security Research as models of CSO involvement process. And finally suggest key aspects to guarantee involvement of CSO in this kind of Multi stakeholder Exchange Platforms.

More information: D5.3 - Recommendation on permanent institutional set-ups for CSO engagement in Security Research (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html)

6. Potential Impact

The impact generated from SecurePART is as per the expected impact defined in the call text for topic **Topic SEC-2013.7.3-1 Increasing the engagement of civil society in security research**:

General impact
The outcomes include an action plan which will help achieving a greater engagement with and involvement of civil society organisations and their advocates in EU security research in the future.
How SecurePART answers to this impact expected
Based on a comprehensive and fine grained study on CSOs needs and their current integration in EU security research on the one hand and a transfer of best practices from other fields of technology research, SecurePART comes up with evidence based recommendations on how to achieve a higher engagement of civil society in EU security research. The SecurePART developed concrete strategies for the integration of CSOs in the whole security research agenda setting process. As this will be accomplished by a close collaboration with actual CSOs and networks of CSOs we will achieve not only an indirect and strategic but also a direct impact on CSO engagement in security research.

7. Dissemination activities and exploitation of results/foregrounds

7.1. Dissemination activities

SecurePART will continue to use the Project website, third party websites, security and research related events, ENNA Internal channels and partners' internal channels like website and mailing lists to disseminate the project achievements by using the following dissemination tools already produced:

- Logo and stationery
- Brochure
- Poster
- Bookmark
- Powerpoint Presentation
- Policy Cycle Poster
- Roll up
- Final Action Plan
- Public Deliverables
- Policy Briefs

- Guide about "Why and how to participate in Horizon 2020 security research?"
- First period results publication
- Guide addressed to promoters of communication activities on security research and with CSOs in particular
- Videos
- Website
- Social Media
- Newsletters

7.2. Exploitation of results

The main goal of the Exploitation is to establish suitable actions to make SecurePART a successful and sustainable project. Generally, it is based on the communication and dissemination strategy elaborated by the SecurePART adopting the most appropriate dissemination tools and channels elaborated so far in order to exploit the results achieved during the project implementation.

The public deliverable D6.8 (http://www.securepart.eu/en/public-results.html) provides an overview of the designed dissemination materials to exploit the accomplished results and outlines the exploitable components.

More specifically, the objectives of this exploitation plan are:

- to establish and maintain mechanisms for effective exploitation
- to inform stakeholders of the project development and encourage interactions/ networking
- to coordinate all levels and types of exploitation of the knowledge produced by the project
- to ensure that information is shared with appropriate audiences on a timely basis and by the most effective means.

More information is available on:

- the project's website: http://www.securepart.eu/
- the project's BLOG: http://blog.securepart.eu
- the project's LinkedIn group: https://www.linkedin.com/groups?home=&gid=8127775
- YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC1-qLqAONMBJCmHMrf_CUSg/videos
- Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/pages/SecurePart-Engagement-of-Civil-Society-Organizations-in-Security-Research/439565109555441
- Twitter: http://www.twitter.com/securepart

Coordinator's Contact detail:

Elizabeth Isaacs - ei@bantec.es

www.securepart.eu

bantec group

www.bantec.es

vdlconsult Space & Security

www.vdlconsult.de

enna

www.ennaeurope.org

ne us

Institut für Kooperationsmanagement
und interdisziplinäre Forschung

www.nexusinstitut.de

GOETHE
UNIVERSITÄT
FRANKFURT AM MAIN

www.uni-frankfurt.de

University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

www.salford.ac.uk

LOBA®
CUSTOMER
EXPERIENCE
DESIGN

www.loba.pt