

Dear Ms Ciobanu,

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to your article on FP7 security research. We believe that a number of points raised by you could benefit from some clarification.

1. You state that FRONTEX, as a member of the Security Advisory Group "[...] takes part on crucial decision making that allocate enormous amounts of research funding towards projects of defence contractors." This description is not in line with the responsibilities of the Sec AG:

- **The FP7 Security Advisory Group is not involved in any way in the evaluation of proposals received by the Commission** for the annual calls of the FP7 Security Theme. The evaluation of proposals is done by independent experts, the results of these evaluations are then validated by the FP7 Member States.
- **The FP7 Security Advisory Group does not decide on the topics that are integrated in the Work Programme.** The selection of topics and the validation of the Security Work Programme is the sole responsibility of the Commission and the FP7 Member States.
- **The FP7 Security Advisory Group has no authority whatsoever; its sole responsibility is to advise the Commission on possible research topics.** It has no influence on EU security policy.

2. We would also like to underline that the involvement of FRONTEX in research is a legal obligation of FRONTEX according to the *COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 2007/2004 of 26 October 2004 - establishing a European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union* as amended in 2011.

This regulation explicitly states that:

- "The Agency should follow up on the developments in scientific research relevant for its field and disseminate this information to the Commission and to the Member States."
- "1. The Agency shall perform the following tasks: [...] d) participate in the development of research relevant for the control and surveillance of external borders;"
- "Article 6 Monitoring and contributing to research: The Agency shall proactively monitor and contribute to the developments in research relevant for the control and surveillance of external borders and disseminate that information to the Commission and the Member States."

3. We also believe that the following statement is highly ambiguous: *"Defence contractors and their lobby groups, that extract enormous funding from the Commission for developing drones, land surveillance bots as well as biometrics etc. have dominating the European Security Research Program since its initiation 2004 and have played a key role in designing and implementing its new border regime."*

While there certainly are a number of companies active in FP7 security research that are covering civilian and defence research, we do believe that the term "defence contractors" is slightly misleading.

First of all, there is no military research in FP7. This is explicitly stated in the FP7 Specific Programme (see: COUNCIL DECISION of 19 December 2006 concerning the Specific Programme "Cooperation" implementing the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities (2007 to 2013):

"The Security Research theme has an exclusively civil application focus and it supports the implementation of Community policies and initiatives relevant to security such as the establishment of an area of freedom, security and justice, transport, health (including the EU Health Security Programme¹), civil protection (including natural and industrial disasters), energy, environment and external policies."

Secondly, many of those "defence contractors" are in fact companies with a very large portfolio that largely exceeds the sole defence dimension. As an example, AIRBUS which is almost exclusively civilian, is responsible for over 50% of the revenues of EADS.

Thirdly, we would like to underline that supporting the EU security industry is also a legal obligation of the FP7 Security Theme, see:

"Through this, the theme will contribute to growth and employment and the competitiveness of the European security industry."

This legal obligation has also been clearly stated in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union:

Article 179 (ex Article 163 TEC) 1. The Union shall have the objective of strengthening its scientific and technological bases by achieving a European research area in which researchers, scientific knowledge and technology circulate freely, and encouraging it to become more competitive, including in its industry, while promoting all the research activities deemed necessary by virtue of other Chapters of the Treaties.

Fourthly, we would like to mention that universities and research institutes are far more dependent on EU funds than large industry participants. They do in fact receive more funding through FP7 than industry participants.

Finally, it should also be noted, that industry representatives are quintessential for a technology oriented theme such as the Security Theme. It is not possible to get an expertise

on the technical feasibility of a research project without industry representation. Similarly, the implementation of a research project is not feasible without a company that can turn the theoretical analysis into a functioning technology. Initiating security research without technological partners would be an inexcusable waste of public money.

4. We also believe that the passage is incorrect: *"In 2006 the European Security Research Advisory Board joint chairs were the directors of Thales and EADS [...]"*. While co-chair Mr Markus Hellenthal was indeed working at the time for EADS, the other co-chair Mr Helmut Krünes was actually working at the "Austrian Institute of Technology".

5. We can certainly not agree with the statement that: *"All along the way of developing the new border regime of the European Union the industry is omnipresent while civil sector and other critical voices appear to be effectively excluded from important forums as well as decision making procedures."*

As stated above, the selection of topics and the validation of the Security Work Programme is the sole responsibility of the Commission and the FP7 Member States. The evaluation of proposals is done by independent experts, the results of these evaluations are then validated by the FP7 Member States.

The members FP7 Security Advisory Group do not decide on the topics that are integrated in the Work Programme nor do they take part in the evaluation process.

Additionally, the Sec AG as well as ESRIF and ESRAB are by far not dominated by industry nor are representatives from civil society excluded from these groups or forums. The Sec AG included for instance representatives from the German and Polish civil protection services, various universities, European Agencies, the Israeli Red Cross, national authorities and research institutes. Only 6 out of the 22 members of the Sec AG are in fact industry representatives.

6. We would also like to mention that the FP7 Security Theme is giving the utmost importance to societal aspects and considerations. All security research projects are closely scrutinised by an ethical review. DG ENTR also set up an independent Societal Impact Expert Working Group, whose final report has been added to the guide for applicants for the FP7 Security Theme. Among the members of this expert group is Mr Ben Hayes, who you mention in your article.

7. Concerning your statements on EUROSUR the following should be clarified:

- The implementation of the different components of EUROSUR is carried out in a decentralised manner by Member States and Frontex. As a result, Member States have concluded dozens of contracts with different companies, usually using co-funding from the External Borders Fund. The Commission and Frontex have so far mainly contracted small and medium sized companies, such as the German company ESG for developing the technical concepts for EUROSUR, the British consultancy company GHK for calculating the financial cost estimates and the Spanish company GMV for establishing the EUROSUR communication network on a pilot basis.

- One of the main objectives of EUROSUR is to considerably reduce the unacceptable death toll of migrants drowning when travelling in small, often unseaworthy boats. The FP7 programme is currently being exploited to develop technical capabilities for detecting and tracking such small boats with the purpose of improving the capability of Member States and Frontex to better protect and save migrants' and refugees' lives. Testing will be carried out in 2013-2014 in the framework of dedicated FP7 projects and Frontex' coordinated joint operations.
- The cost estimates of the 'Borderline' study are highly inflated. One explanation for this miscalculation is that the study is based on wrong assumptions. For instance, the authors of this study, who never contacted the Commission for clarification, were not making any distinction between establishment and maintenance costs. Furthermore, they were simply including any kind of FP7 and extrapolating current high spending to the next financial perspective. It should be underlined that a comparison between the Commission's cost estimates provided in the impact assessment accompanying the EUROSUR legislative proposal and the real costs spent in 2011-2012 clearly shows that the real costs are considerably lower than estimated by the Commission, not to mention the cost estimates provided in the 'Borderline' study.