

Multi-level Alignment of Regional Approaches to Critical Infrastructure Resilience by Learning from Experience

Deliverable 4.2.1: Proceedings of the workshop on the multi-level Framework.

Project N.:	HOME/2012/C1PS/AG/4000003759
Document Type:	Public Deliverable
Document ID:	D.4.2.1
WP:	4
Task Leader:	Scottish Government
Authors:	James Urquhart, Robert Gibson and David Bamaung
Last modified:	2015/03/01
Txt:	



4th International Workshop on Regional Critical Infrastructure Resilience:

“Aligning Regional, National and European CIR Approaches”

Workshop Report

Contents :

1. Aims, Objectives and Format.
2. Workshop Programme.
3. Keynote presentation.
4. Workshop Feedback – Session 1.
5. Workshop Feedback – Session 2.
6. MiRACLE Partners - Project Updates.
7. Key Issues for MiRACLE Project.

- Annex A: List of Delegates.
Annex B: Delegate Evaluation.
Annex C: Delegate responses to Questionnaire.

Acknowledgements:

Workshop Organisers:

- James Urquhart, Scottish Government
 - email james.urquhart@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
- Robert Gibson, Scottish Government
 - email robert.gibson@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
- David Bamaung, Scottish Government
 - Email david.bamaung@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
- Ross Baird, Scottish Government
 - Email ross.baird@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
- Paul Scobbie, Scottish Government
 - Email paul.scobbie@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

1. Aim, Objectives and Format of the workshop

Aim

To support the delivery of tasks within the MiRACLE Project namely:

Task 4 – “Building a Multilevel Framework to Align Regional Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategies with National and EU Policies”. Scottish Government hosted workshops for the main stakeholders involved in Critical Infrastructure resilience (CIP) and Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) at EU, National and Regional level, to focus on understanding and collecting views on the challenges and opportunities that exist in relation to multi-level alignment.

Objectives

To consider the strategic global Geo-political, Geo-social and Geo-economic issues that need to be taken into account in developing CIR Strategies and Policies at EU, National and Regional level.

To explore the challenges and opportunities that exist in relation to the alignment of EU, National and Regional CIR Strategies and Policy and to consider how to improve alignment to ensure effective delivery of strategy at all levels.

To take the opportunity that the workshop provides to update delegates on the delivery of and learning from the specific tasks currently being undertaken within the MiRACLE Project.

Workshop Format

- Date: 10 October 2014.
- Venue: Scottish Government, 5 Atlantic Quay, Glasgow.
- Type: Presentations and Interactive Sessions.

2. Workshop Programme

Wednesday 8 October

1900 **Pre-Workshop Networking Reception –
Marriott Hotel, Glasgow**

Friday 10 October

Workshop

**James Watt A&B, Scottish Government, 5 Atlantic Quay, 150 Broomielaw,
Glasgow, G2 8LU**

‘Alignment of Regional, National and European CIR Approaches’

0830 - 0850 Coffee and Registration

0850 - 0900 Welcome and Introduction to Day 2 – James Urquhart

0900 – 0910 Delegate evaluation of day 1 - “Sharing Experiences and Best practices for the Implementation of Regional Critical Infrastructures Resilience Strategies”

0910 - 1000 Key Note Speaker, Peter de Bruijn – **“Ingredients for Collaboration”**

1000 - 1015 Refreshment Break

1015 - 1200 Interconnectedness Workshop – considering the strategic global Geo-political, Geo-social and Geo-economic issues that need to be taken into account in developing EU, National and Regional CIR arrangements

1200 - 1300 Lunch and Networking

1300 - 1430 Strategic Horizon Scanning Workshop – considering alignment of EU, National and Regional approaches to CIR – involving interactive workshop and input from EC, UK Government and Scottish Government perspectives, reflecting challenges and opportunities to enhance alignment

1430 - 1445 Refreshment Break

1445 - 1645 MiRACLE Update from Partners – Scotland, Kennemerland and Lombardy will update on their Pilot, Case Study and other relevant CIR tasks allocated within MiRACLE

1645 - 1700 Plenary

3. Keynote Presentation

- **Peter de Bruijn**

Peter provided a very thought provoking presentation that sought to give the audience a perspective on the challenges for collaboration on a regional, national and international level. He entitled his presentation, “Ingredients for Collaboration” and focussed on best practices that were introduced to the audience in the form of short case studies from Peters’ own international working experience. Each case involved a need for innovation and collaboration between several public/private (inter)national organisations. From the cases came the following themes:

- Find a common interest.
- Collaborate with people, not institutes or functions.
- Disaster can be a driver but the effect doesn’t last.
- Reframe.
- Become a trusted party.
- Understand each other’s processes.
- Create a strong knowledge & information position.
- Blend into local procedures.
- Create win-win situations.
- Make use of existing resources and initiatives.
- Create a clear demarcation in time and space.
- Make it fun to participate.

Peter promoted all of these ingredients as useful when forming an international workgroup for Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR). Peter suggested that international Transportation and Logistics could be used as a driver, because disruptions in transportation will have a direct effect on our daily way of living. Closing down a major transportation hub such as the ports at Rotterdam or Grangemouth, will have considerable impact on food and fuel supplies and therefore result in severe economic effects. Peter offered the use of the ‘Coasthopping’ program as a living lab to show the urgency for the formation of a CIR group and as best practice for improving the resilience of Transport & Logistics as critical infrastructure.

Peter’s presentation is available along with the other workshop documentation on the MiRACLE project website <http://miracle-project.eu/>

4. Workshop Feedback – Session 1

Interconnectedness

This session was facilitated by David Robson and Victoria Loughlan, Scottish Government Strategic Assessment Team. David and Victoria used an interactive workshop to assist the attendees to reflect on the interconnected and complex nature of our world and the emergent threats and hazards. The

purpose of this session was to focus minds on the 'Big Picture' with Geo-political, Geo-economic and Geo-social issues providing the strategic context for our Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) discussions. The session was designed to demonstrate the complex nature of systems and the interconnectedness, not just of infrastructure, but of politics and economics in the global village that we all live in. In effect, this complex problem requires a coordinated and multi-level response. Indeed, this is the purpose of MiRACLE.

David and Victoria separated the attendees into a number of small syndicate groups, where they were asked to work their way through a series of exercises focusing on the nexus between Water, Food and Energy Security, while operating within a much wider strategic context where Geo-political, Geo-economic and Geo-social issues were considered.

Following the syndicate exercises, David and Victoria facilitated an open discussion where attendees discussed the learning and outcomes from their deliberations. All the groups identified the significant interconnectedness of our modern world and the extremely complex dependencies and interdependencies that exist between infrastructure sectors, across sectors and increasingly, across supply chains. Indeed, David and Victoria suggested that some of these interconnected issues can often build up together to create a 'perfect storm' scenario, where political, economic and social disruption can erupt as a direct consequence.

As highlighted above, this session helped to provide the challenge for us to consider later in the workshop during the CIR Rapid Reflection Session.

5. Workshop Feedback – Session 2

Rapid Reflection

Background

Strategic Horizon Scanning is not a new concept. The development of the Rapid Reflection Model by Scottish Government however, is a new approach, which is still in its infancy. It allows strategic decision makers to consider critical global issues and to reflect on three key aspects – 'the current situation,' 'the historic context,' and 'strategic direction.'

The Rapid Reflection Model is a tool that has been designed to assist strategic decision makers in developing future strategy and policy based on a very clear assessment of critical issues. The authors of the model, David Robson and Victoria Loughlan, are based within the Scottish Government Strategic Assessment Team. Although the model is still under development, it has already attracted the attention of a number of Government Departments and Agencies.

Introduction

Attendees at the International CIR Workshop were asked to consider the challenge of how to improve alignment between Regional, National and European CIR strategy/policy, governance and delivery. We agreed to use the Rapid Reflection Model in order to assist attendees to reflect on the historic, current and future issues affecting Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) in Scotland, the United Kingdom and Europe, and then to identify strategic issues that need to be taken forward in order to address gaps that currently exist between the three levels (Regional, National and European).

The session was facilitated by David Robson and Victoria Loughlan, Scottish Government, who separated the attendees into two groups of approximately 25 and ran two parallel sessions lasting 1.5 hours. Participants were invited to read through and reflect on a large visual timeline setting out the key issues affecting CIR and to add post-it notes providing their different perspectives and views on the issues highlighted. This was followed by a short interactive open session where David and Victoria facilitated a discussion to draw out the reflections of participants further.

Following the session, a briefing document was produced showing the visual timeline with the various comments from attendees added.

The documents are available along with the other workshop documentation on the MiRACLE project website <http://miracle-project.eu/>

Summary

The following bullet points provide a summary of both sessions, using the three key aspects of the model - Current Situation, Historic Context and Strategic Direction:

1. Current Situation

- Acceptance that there is a fragmented landscape between European, National and Regional CIR interests and activities.
- Recognition that we lack a European CIR Strategy to provide a more coordinated approach across the above three levels.
- Not convinced that the current CIP arrangements are working – lack of top down and bottom up engagement with stakeholders.
- Current EU Directive is too restricted in terms of Sector focus and scope needs to widen to include the added value of National and Regional CIR programmes – bottom up approach.
- Interconnectedness across the three levels and the interdependencies between the CI Sectors, make a collaborative approach essential if we are to realise enhanced CIR at an EU, National and Regional level.

2. Historic Context

- Recognition that CIR has emerged in a UK and Scottish context through a process of change from Post War through to the current day.
- The UK and Scottish CIR context has been shaped to a large extent through domestic terrorism, then International terrorist threats and more

recently through response to climate change and severe weather events, resulting in a truly 'all-risks' approach to CIR.

- CIR also shaped by a move from Public to Private ownership and more recently a move from domestic to foreign ownership/investment.
- Historic context has also seen a move from Civil Defence (Post War and Cold War) to Civil Emergencies (Post Cold War) where the 'all-risks' approach to CIR has flourished.
- Early European focus on developing a Common Market has moved to developing closer Political and Monetary Union, resulting in greater level of interconnectedness across Europe.
- From a Sector and Industry perspective, there has been a move from an independent production to a more interconnected production and supply chain model, again resulting in greater interdependency issues and fragility in terms of 'just in time' demand and supply issues.
- UK and Scottish CIR context also influenced by the United Kingdom Government CONTEST Strategy (Counter Terrorism Strategy), the National Security Strategy (NSS), the Scottish CIR Strategy (Secure and Resilient), the establishment of the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI) and the definition of CNI and the now 11 Sectors – the relevance of the EU Directive definitely in question.

3. Strategic Direction

- Structural Drivers for CIR were seen to include; Interdependencies between Sectors and Interconnectedness across Europe, Member States and Regions of Member States, the Financial Crisis Post 2008, Governance and Collaboration, CIR Strategy Policy and Guidance, Climate Change and the Geo-Political Threat picture (all risks approach).
- Policy Alignment – we need to develop a Multi-level framework that better aligns EU, National and Regional approaches to CIR.
- Key Themes to be included in the Multi-level framework are; we need to Understand our Connected systems, Understand our connected Vulnerabilities, Understand our connected and collaborative response arrangements – while raising the profile of Community Resilience to ensure that our communities do not become totally reliant on Government and Industry to 'meet their every need'.
- Need to agree who the CIR Strategy is for and determine a shared EU vision (that should be described in more detail in a revised EU Directive)
- In terms of Governance, how do we bring the three levels together? Need creative approaches to this issue including full use of new technologies (secure Video Conferencing).
- In terms of Collaboration, we need to agree a realistic timetable for change that looks at short, medium and long term solutions/deliverables
- Need to engage Third Sector, Volunteers and Communities in delivery of CIR at a National and Regional level.
- Need a long term programme of CIR delivery that isn't impacted by changes in the Political landscape (short term, 4/5 year Parliamentary programmes resulting in a stop/start impact on long term CIR enhancement).

- Need to develop a resilience and collaboration CIR Culture as opposed to a Risk Mitigation and Compliance CIR Culture.
- Short Steps, with short term, mid-term and longer term solutions.
- Resilience should be in our DNA.

6. MiRACLE Partners - Project Updates

Scottish Government

Summary of Scottish Government (SG) updates.

- Case Study

David Bamaung advised delegates that the Scottish partners chose an insider threat and organisational resilience exercising programme (Operation Estrela), which was developed by Police Scotland and supported by the Scottish Government Critical Infrastructure Resilience Unit (CIRU), as the case study for Scotland. The exercise is designed to identify organisational vulnerabilities within the Personnel function (including Recruitment, Human Resources Management and Training), Line Management, Business Continuity Management and Resilience areas of an organisation.

Operation Estrela has now been adopted by the UK police and ambulance service as the national insider threat and resilience management exercising product, and the Fire and Rescue Service are developing a similar product with the help of Police Scotland. A representative from VRK attended one of the police sector exercises as an observer. In addition to its adoption within the emergency services sector, it is also planned to develop the product in other critical infrastructure sectors such as finance and energy, although this development will take place out-with the time frame of Miracle.

- Pilot (application of international Good Practice in a regional CIP/R programme).

Robert Gibson informed delegates that the Scottish Government had selected the multimedia platform for communication between CI Operators and the Lombardy Region Control Room, known as SUSI (Single system for the exchange of information), as the pilot.

He summarised the business benefits of the system, which included:

- Timely communication – information provided according to the steps of the emergency plan.
- Enhanced collaboration.
- Rapid spread of information to all of the involved organizations.
- Standardized contents of the messages – increased quality and understandability of the shared information.
- Standardized, interoperable and secure communication channel.

He then gave an overview of the process that would be adopted during the pilot, namely:

- Comparing the SUSI business benefits against the current CIR programme deliverables in Scotland.
 - Identifying gaps.
 - Assessing and evaluating the transferability and implementation effort required to replicate the business benefits, where gaps exist, in Scotland.
 - Providing a report for the MiRACLE project.
 - Delivering an implementation programme.
- CIRINT.NET – Critical Infrastructure Resilience International Network

James Urquhart gave an overview of project task 5, which is concerned with “**Community building and dissemination activities**”. To assure long lasting impacts and benefit from MIRACLE project, an international CIR Network will be set up, utilising the network of relationships, enhanced as a result of the project activities. Scottish Government will therefore host a consultative workshop to discuss/debate the CIR International Network development with all delegates who are interested in being part of it.

He advised that Scottish Government has carried out research to consider best practice options for establishing the CIR Network as a formal association. Scottish Government is involved in the Global Futures Forum (GFF), through David Robson and used this connection to consider a TOR and governance arrangements for the fledgling CIR Network.

Aim – to establish a governance arrangement to support the development of a formal CIR Network not just in Europe, but at a Global level.

A draft Terms of Reference was included in the workshop delegate pack and also available via the MiRACLE Website. This is the basis for discussion and the text is simply intended to provide a starter document, which will be refined further over the coming months.

He highlighted some of the key issues within the draft TOR, which need to be agreed in terms of establishing a formal network.

- Nature and purpose:
 - Generate understanding on CIR.
 - Identify and exchange good practice.
 - Facilitate outreach and research.
- Membership:
 - A ‘Member’ is an organisation (Govt/Industry/Responder/Other).
 - A ‘Participant’ is an individual acting on behalf of a member organisation.
 - Access to membership and participation will require careful management via National Coordinators through a ‘lead organisation’.

- Requires verification process and an element of trust and accountability – hence reason for membership rights and responsibilities.
- Resources:
 - Concept of 'in kind' resource contribution.
 - Finance.
 - Staff and equipment.
- Governance:
 - Three elements – Executive Board, Coordinator and General Meetings.
 - Coordinator – the GFF have a dedicated full-time Coordinator, is that feasible for the network or is another model required?
- Website:
 - The MiRACLE Website is up and running at the moment.
 - Existing website, complemented by some social media based initiative (Facebook/LinkedIn website), which will be easy to maintain after the end of the project.
 - Three key issues for the website are Access, Functionality and Security.

In conclusion he intimated that the network is one of the most important legacy issues from MiRACLE if the ambition of effective collaboration is to be realised. It will be necessary to consult further on this with our wider list of stakeholders in the USA, Canada and Australia before arrangements are finalised.

The arrangements will be developed fully in time for the final MiRACLE Conference/5 International CIR Workshop in Milan in June 2015, where a formal launch the new network will take place.

VRK (Veiligheidsregio Kennemerland)

Summary of VRK updates.

- Case study (Simon Stenneberg)
 - VRK selected Schiphol as their case study.
 - The case study describes the main crisis response organisation, the crisis management plans and the committees in which Schiphol, the municipality and VRK discuss different topics within the collaboration.
 - Simon explained the history of our collaboration and the lessons learned over the years.
 - VRK and Schiphol practice together and the most important incident they have handled, and learned from, is the crash of the Turkish Airlines airplane in February 2009.
- Pilot (Simon Stenneberg)
 - VRK is developing a Network Vital Safety North – Holland

- The partners in this network are adjoining safety regions and vital partners such as drinking water, energy, surface water management and rail transport.
- The tasks of the network are:
 - Alignment between the different vital partners.
 - Alignment with our neighbor safety regions.
 - Alignment with other risk partners.
 - To create joint opportunities not differences.
- Since we are in the early stages of this network, we would like to learn from Scotland how to develop this network further.
- Outstanding actions and wider context (Kim Zuurmond)
 - The outstanding actions for VRK are to complete the pilot and give input on the deliverables of the MiRACLE partners.
 - Kim explained the context in which VRK operates at this moment.
 - On a national level the Ministry is redefining the term ‘social disruption’. They are doing so by developing criteria to measure the social disruption in terms of economic impact, physical impact and societal impact.
 - Another national project aims to define the role of the Ministry, The safety region and the Critical Infrastructure partners in Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) / Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR).

The presentation is available along with the other workshop documentation on the MiRACLE project website <http://miracle-project.eu/>

Lombardy Region

Summary of Fondazione Politecnico di Milano (FPM) / Regione Lombardia (REGLOM) / Risk Governance Solutions (RGS) updates.

Cinzia Secchi spoke of the Lombardy approach, advising that the analysis has evolved from a monothematic approach to an integrated one. She also informed delegates of the integrated regional program for risk mitigation and the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Agreement. Her presentation provides additional detail of every aspect of the work.

Cinzia informed delegates that Lombardy Region has chosen Public – Private Partnerships (PPP’s) evolutionary model of Governance as the pilot project. The study of other cases in the world spurred Lombardy Region to wonder where the difficulties lie and to research new ideas for increasing the effectiveness of Lombardy PPP. Lombardy Region identified four key points in order to evolve its governance policy:

- To constitute a regional centre that deals with Critical Infrastructure Protection and Resilience (CIP/R).
- To involve other local authorities and stakeholders in CIP/R.
- To establish a scientific committee and define its role and rules.

- To define the building of a financial fund (for sustaining all activities of the agreement) and how to maintain it .

Finally, Cinzia advised that Lombardy Region is working on improving Critical Infrastructure Resilience during Expo 2015.

The presentation is available along with the other workshop documentation on the MiRACLE project website <http://miracle-project.eu/>

7. Delegate Evaluation

Delegates (See Annex A for list of delegates) were provided with an evaluation form in their delegate packs relative to the Visits and Workshops on Alignment and the CIR International Network. Delegates were able to complete the evaluation form during the course of the event or retrospectively, via an electronic version.

Delegates were asked to comment under the following headings:

- a) Most significant learning.
- b) Key suggestions for improving the alignment of Regional, National and EU Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) arrangements.
- c) Key suggestions for building an effective collaborative approach to enhance alignment.
- d) Expectations in terms of 1). Visits, 2). Venues, 3). Presentations / Interactive Sessions, 4). Hotel, 5). Event materials.
- e) Issues (policy or response) for further consideration by International Network.
- f) Additional comments.

In general delegates were very positive about the structure and delivery of the event, indicating that the aims and objectives were met. The responses from delegates, relative to the workshop, are reproduced in full at Annex B.

8. Recommendations for aligning Regional, National and European CIR Approaches

During the 4th International Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) Workshop, delegates participated in interactive workshop sessions and listened to presentations from a number of experts on the subject of CIR and in particular on the question – how do we improve alignment of Regional, National and European approaches to CIR?

Over the course of the workshop, including informal network discussions, it became clear that the strategic drivers for CIR alignment, include;

- The fragile and interconnected nature of our World.
- Interdependencies between Sectors and Interconnectedness across Europe.
- Member States and Regions of Member States.
- The Financial Crisis Post 2008.
- The need for coordination, governance and collaboration.

- The need for clarity at a European, National and Regional level on CIR Strategy Policy and Guidance.
- Climate Change and the Geo-Political Threat picture (all risks approach).

In effect, what we require is CIR Policy Alignment – we need to develop a Multi-level framework that better aligns EU, National and Regional approaches to CIR, while recognising that alignment is a continuous process of interaction between actors on multiple scales concerned with the respective field of CIR.

Following the Workshop, the Scottish Government MiRACLE Team conducted an analysis of the various outputs, contributions and interactive discussion in order to identify the following key recommendations to be taken forward. We decided to arrange these recommendations under the following three headings – Strategy, Governance and Collaboration, as most of the issues raised during the Workshop could be grouped under these headings. These recommendations will be considered as part of the wider work to be taken forward under Task 4 of the MiRACLE Project.

1. Strategy

1.1 The European Union requires a clear strategy for Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) that sets the purpose, vision and strategic objectives for an aligned Regional, National and European approach to CIR – the Strategy will need to set out clearly the benefits of engagement in this work – alignment needs to be CIR specific.

1.2 The European Union requires to conduct an urgent review of the 2008 EU Directive on Critical Infrastructures – a new Directive is required that seeks to support the overarching CIR Strategy by describing in greater detail the alignment of Regional, National and European approaches to CIR.

1.3 Themes to be included in the CIR Strategy are; Harmonisation of CIR concept and approach, Understand our connected systems, Understand our connected vulnerabilities, Understand our connected and collaborative response arrangements – while raising the profile of Community Resilience to ensure that our communities do not become totally reliant on Government and Industry to ‘meet their every need’.

1.4 We need to agree who the CIR Strategy is for and determine a shared EU vision (that should be described in more detail in a revised EU Directive).

1.5 The Strategy will require Strategic Objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable and realistic, with agreed timelines and milestones in terms of delivery – in effect, this will provide the strategic imperative for the next three years of fast track development of the strategy.

1.6 Need to develop a Resilience and Collaboration CIR Culture as opposed to a Risk Mitigation and Compliance CIR Culture.

2. Governance

2.1 The European Union, National Governments and Regional Assemblies, need to establish CIR governance arrangements at European (CIP), National

Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) and Regional (CIRINT.NET) level.

2.2 This new 'aligned' governance arrangement will require creative approaches to this issue including full use of new technologies, such as on-line discussion tools, teleconferencing and video conferencing – face to face meetings involving representatives from all three levels of governance will also be useful in assuring alignment.

2.3 The governance arrangement will also require an aligned programme of CIR work that isn't impacted by changes in the political landscape (short term, 4/5 year parliamentary programmes resulting in a stop/start impact on long term CIR enhancement).

2.4 Develop a common methodology across the governance arrangements to enable a deeper understanding of the different perspectives and approaches – identify common goals and benefits – work towards an agreed solution.

2.5 Consider inclusion of Critical Infrastructure Operators and Industry experts – possibly as an external liaison/consultation group.

2.6 Establish working groups based on 'Communities of Interest' in order to drive specific areas of work on behalf of the strategic groups.

3. Collaboration

3.1 Establish 3 levels of CIR network – Regional, National and European (in effect this is currently in place at a European level with the CIP Network and at a National level with the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) and the European Reference Network for Critical Infrastructure Protection (ERNICIP) – the gap currently exists at a Regional level, although the CIRINT.NET could fulfil this function).

3.2 As above, formally establish the CIRINT.NET as the Regional CIR Network – although this is a task within the MiRACLE Project itself, this issue needs to be raised to a strategic level within the European Union as a matter of urgency – we must seize the opportunity following the 4th International Workshop in Glasgow and use the sense of purpose and enthusiasm shown by delegates to drive this issue forward.

3.3 Establish formal interaction between and across the three levels of network, both formal and informal.

3.4 Establish strong information sharing arrangements to support on-going collaboration initiatives – to include on-line, teleconference, video conference and face to face interaction.

3.5 In terms of Collaboration, we need to agree a realistic timetable for change that looks at short, medium and long term solutions/deliverables.

3.6 Need to engage all stakeholders including Government, Industry/CI Operators and Responders, including Third Sector, Volunteers and Communities in delivery of CIR at a National and Regional level.

3.7 Create opportunities for CIR stakeholders to come together regularly at conferences, workshops, events and exercises to build an effective network based on trust and openness, where good practice and experience can be shared and new concepts can be challenged and developed further into effective solutions for change.

3.8 Use new and innovative methods of facilitation to create a space for CIR stakeholders to interact – a safe and secure environment is also vital given the nature of the topic.

3.9 The network needs to understand stakeholder needs and deliver added value to ensure buy-in.

List of Delegates

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANISATION	EMAIL
Delegates			
Koletsis	Spyridon	KEMEA - The Centre for Security Studies, Greece	s.koletsis@yahoo.gr
Arnautidis	Panagiotis	KEMEA - The Centre for Security Studies, Greece	panarn@gmail.com
Sfetsos	Athanasios	KEMEA - The Centre for Security Studies, Greece	ts@ipta.demokritos.gr
Altenbrunn	Frank	Council of General Affairs Division, Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW)	Frank.Aldenbrunn@thw.de
Gordon	Gary	UK	-
Tillotson	Sam	UK	-
Ferguson	Eilís	Northern Ireland Civil Service,	Eilis.Ferguson@drdni.gsi.gov.uk
Connolly	Paul	Eire Government	Paul.Connolly@defence.ie
Ryan	John	Regional Steering Group [South] Eire	john_ryan@corkcity.ie
Roche	John	An Garda Síochána (Irish Police)	<a href="mailto:Roche, John <john.roche@garda.ie>">Roche, John <john.roche@garda.ie>
Prouse	Mark	UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC)	mark.prouse@decc.gsi.gov.uk
Donnan	Catherine	British Telecom	catherine.donnan@bt.com

Campbell	Iain	UK Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	Iain.Campbell@mcga.gov.uk
Ronnie	Bobby	Scottish Government, Head of Resilience Division	bobby.ronnie@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Cuddihy	John	Police Scotland	John.Cuddihy@scotland.pnn.police.uk
Brown	Colin	Police Scotland, Emergency Procedures	colin.brown@scotland.pnn.police.uk
Morris	Rosalind	Police Scotland	rosalind.morris@scotland.pnn.police.uk
Colthart	David	Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE)	david.colthart@see.com
Gardner	Andrew	INEOS	andrew.gardner@petroineos.com
Duncan	Richard	Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS)	Richard.Duncan@firescotland.gov.uk
Lyons	Bill	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	<a href="mailto:Lyons B (Bill) <bill.lyons@sepa.org.uk>">Lyons B (Bill) <bill.lyons@sepa.org.uk>
Murphy	Mark	Scottish Water	Mark.murphy@scottishwater.co.uk
Strathearn	Dugald	DEFRA	dugald.strathearn@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Jensen	Peter	Metroselskabet I/S, DK-2300 Copenhagen S. Denmark	pjn@m.dk
Schwab	Maria	Institute for Environment and Human Security (UNU-EHS), United Nations University	schwab@ehs.unu.edu
McIlhatton	David	University of Ulster	d.mcilhatton@ulster.ac.uk
Millar	William	Transport Scotland	william.millar@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk

Lang	Mary-Ellen	Edinburgh Local Authority	mary-ellen.lang@edinburgh.gov.uk
Nicoll	Margaret	Scottish Government	margaret.nicoll@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Pritchard	Lynne	Scottish Government	Lynne.Pritchard@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
			-
Wilson	Frank	Public Safety & Health Distric Kennemerland and Schiphol	frankwilson@btconnect.com
Buis	Marit	Veiligheidsregio Rotterdam- Rijnmond	Marit.Buis@veiligheidsregio-rr.nl
Bok	Maaike	Liander N.V., Arnhem	maaike.bok@alliander.com
Kouwenhoven	Ino	PWN (Water)	Ino.Kouwenhoven@PWN.NL
Zuurmond	Kim	VRK	KZuurmond@ggdkenemerland.nl
Stenneberg	Simon	VRK	sstenneberg@vrk.nl
Seen	Sjaak	Safety Region Rotterdam	j.seen@veiligheidsregio-rr.nl
Ornstein	Marijn	Schiphol Airport, Amsterdam	ornstein_m@schiphol.nl
De Lange- Heldens	Marleen	Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland	marleen.lange@rijnland.net
Derksen	John	MoD	-
Tenpierik	Maikel	ProRail	maikel.tenpierik@prorail.nl

			-
Amarillo	Fabrizio	Fondazione Politecnico di Milano	Fabrizio Amarilli <fabrizio.amarilli@polimi.it>
Dimauro	Carmelo	Risk Governance Solutions	carmelo.dimauro@riskgovernancesolutions.eu
Trucco	Paolo	Fondazione Politecnico di Milano	Paolo Trucco <paolo.trucco@polimi.it>
Petrenj	Boris	Fondazione Politecnico di Milano	Boris Petrenj <boris.petrenj@polimi.it>
Secchi	Cinzia	Regione Lombardia	cinzia_secchi@regione.lombardia.it
Ceriani	Massimo	Regione Lombardia	Massimo_ceriani@regione.lombardia.it
Zangari	Roberto	Regione Lombardia	Roberto_zangari@regione.lombardia.it
Zaccone	Andrea	Regione Lombardia	zaccone_andrea@regione.lombardia.it

Event Organisers

Gibson	Robert	Scottish Government - CIRU	robert.gibson@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
--------	--------	----------------------------	--

Speakers / Facilitators

Robson	David	Scottish Government - Energy	david.robson@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
--------	-------	------------------------------	--

Loughlan	Victoria	Scottish Government	Victoria.Loughlan@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
De Bruijn	Peter	Director Studio Veiligheid	peter.debruijn@studioveiligheid.net
Urquhart	James	Scottish Government - CIRU	james.urquhart@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
Bamaung	David	Scottish Government - CIRU	david.bamaung@scotland.gsi.gov.uk



Regione Lombardia



**4TH International workshop on
Regional Critical Infrastructure Resilience:
“ALIGNING REGIONAL, NATIONAL AND EUROPEAN CIR APPROACHES”**

DELEGATE EVALUATION

Most significant learning:

- Work together in order to obtain best results in term of time, efficiency and durability of results.
- Sometimes to solve a problem is difficult because everyone has a different interest to solve it.
- A timely reminder of the need to consider the longer term risks as well as the immediate crises of today.
- Again a reminder of the importance of identifying and prioritising the interdependencies between critical sectors.
- The value of visits to critical facilities and how much more we learn from seeing something in operation.
- Partnerships have very different forms in different countries.
- The policy level determines Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Public-Private Partnership (PPP) as much as the strategic and tactical levels who work together from need, but could gain from better policy organisation.
- The voice of the private sector is hard to engage and people are generally interested in how that can be achieved.
- Focus policy.
- Engage private sector Critical Infrastructure (CI) actors to work together and develop a pressure mechanism to ensure policy supporting their needs for partnership development.
- Understand that the European Commission is administrative, and a pressure point not yet explored is via the EU Parliament – which needs MEP support via their respective EUPARL Committees.
- Collaboration with colleagues from other critical infrastructures is absolutely necessary if we want to improve CI resilience
- Thinking about threats is always good, but it is better to see the opportunities that challenges bring.
- It's not the amount of people you know, but who you know.
- The importance of CIP from an Inter-regional, European and World-wide perspective.
- In respect to the first day's events, the importance of managing the media response

during a major event or incident. The case studies discussed were sobering in the simplicity of the small trigger that can escalate into a critical event in such a short space of time. Resilience is one of the vital elements to ensure the protection of the population at these times.

- It is vital that an informal network of experts is established throughout Europe. These experts including the participants of this conference should be encouraged to highlight the importance of a consistent approach when they return to their own governments. This expert group could be the beginning of an effective strategy to establish this approach.
- The importance of collaboration and the development of relationships.
- The need for a cross sectorial approach.
- The importance of interdependencies.
- Some of the challenges concerning CIR/P seem local, but are the same in other countries. What we must consider, is what seems local might actually be international.
- We cannot predict the future, but we can challenge our expectations.
- We should look for a way to evaluate incidents and practices so Critical Infrastructure (CI) partners are free to speak their minds and should not worry about the possibility that a report of their evaluation gets 'out there'.
- CI resilience is a very valuable concept which needs close cooperation between actors across sectors and scales.
- A good network and valuable personal contacts can facilitate, speed-up, or increase effectiveness of CIR strategies.
- Methodological approach to horizon scanning.
- The importance of early networking – the adage, “the crisis is not the time for swapping business cards” is too true.
- I learned a lot about the way that the Scottish Government conducts business with regard CIR and resilience in General (i.e. that it is very good!)
- You can't be prepared for everything.
- Training and collaboration are the key elements when everything goes wrong.
- An effective communication policy (with the public) must be established.
- Communication is the key
- Messages and information passed must be truthful and accurate but should not cause unnecessary panic or alarm.
- The media needs to be managed to give consistent messages that allow informed decision making by affected parties.

Key suggestions for improving the alignment of Regional, National and EU CIR arrangements:

- Exchange information and results of exercises.
- Create opportunities to discuss face- to- face our experiences.
- Work together to make our decision maker acknowledge the importance of the output of Miracle.
- For my sector, continue and build on the excellent cooperation that exists between UK and Scottish Government through mutual representation on sector resilience boards, and look at the possibility of extending this making use of network contacts emerging from the Miracle project. I'd like to follow this up.
- From a wider point of view I believe it would be really valuable for the collaboration that is being achieved through Miracle to be extended beyond the project. For me the greatest

value of what was an excellent event was meeting people from a wide range of backgrounds and countries with a shared interest in resilience issues.

- Show the value and benefit to the target partners – what they gain.
- Explore usage of the workshop techniques used (Victoria and Robert) with CIP partnerships – get them working that way to develop cohesion and ideas.
- Regular Contact.
- Sharing good practices.
- Sharing evaluations and things to improve.
- Establish a network of experts as soon as possible after this conference. This urgency is to take advantage of the good will created during the conference and not to lose the initiative.
- This area is complex and for governments this can cause a lack of understanding of the importance of the subject matter. It is important to develop simple explanations of what Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) is all about. There is a tendency to make this area more complex than it is in reality. An approach is to highlight, 3 strategic, tactical and operational areas of vital importance that need to be addressed. This could be called the strategic imperative for the next three year of fast track development of the strategy.
- Tap into the individual expertise in this area to lead government policy in each member state. All 27 member states should be encouraged to be involved in the proposed network.
- Strategy guidelines and priorities on Critical Infrastructure should be set at the top level and from there protection / mitigation elements cascade down.
- Develop an information exchange forum -- lessons learned -- best practice.
- Develop a collaborative approach at the various levels. Obviously there will be different perspectives at the different levels and sectors and this will be a challenge. But the approach to a crisis management situation should be broadly similar.
- Share lessons learned from (near) incidents or events such as the Commonwealth Games.
- Reach out to each other / get to know each other really well.
- Alignment needs to be CI specific.
- Alignment is a continuous process of interaction between actors on multiple scales concerned with the respective field of CI.
- One needs to find a balance between a flexible approach open for dynamic changes in the course of taking actions and changing condition and a set of regulations which ensure larger and more effective attention to CIR across sectors and scales.
- Continued multi agency/nationality networking events such as this. They really are a useful way of exchanging information, and facilitating the networking of CIR stakeholders.
- Subject Matter Expert presentations / lectures held periodically to provide examples of best practice solutions to CIR issues. These would also raise awareness of CIR as a whole.
- A newsletter outlining recent examples of CIR issues, including best practice, and practical ways for improving individual resilience.
- Establishment of the stakeholders network.
- Geo-political/social/economic issues should be taken into account.
- Resilience must always be considered in the framework of interdependencies between critical infrastructures and alternatives routes and solutions so that to ensure and enhance business and services continuity.
- Share information.
- Build relationships and trust.

- Exercise regularly so that everyone knows their role.

Key suggestions for building an effective collaborative approach to enhance alignment are:

- Within the confines of national security issues it would be useful to make contact with those elsewhere in the network working on specific sectorial issues such as food supply resilience in my case. For example our industry sector resilience boards would be likely to be very interested to hear perspectives from other countries on their perception of the risks facing the sector. Reflecting on the final discussion at the event it occurred to me that we would need to take this kind of “bottom-up” approach as well as tackling the “top-down” governance issues we discussed.
- Show the value and benefit to the target partners – what they gain.
- Participating as much as possible with CI Companies / utilities.
- Better / longer support from the EU.
- Develop and agree a high level strategy for all 27 European Countries.
- Keep the conference network together and build on the good developed during the event.
- A central funding stream to develop the network needs to be established.
- Develop an information sharing network -- lessons learned - what works best-provide guidance.
- Develop a common methodology across the board to enable a deeper understanding of the different perspectives and approaches. Identify common goals and benefits – work towards a solution.
- Create more opportunities and reinforce through interactions and training at events exercises etc.
- I think Peter gave some good suggestions in his presentation. I have no additions to that.
- Build a longer-term institutionalised network/ community of practice.
- Ensure the diversity of actors.
- Establish specific working groups with the network on specific topics without abolishing all-member workshops and meetings.
- Networking.
- Establishment of the stakeholders network.
- Common training curriculum.
- Good personal relations and communication which will ensure the effective exchange of best practices and the establishment of common taxonomy.
- Have regular multi agency meetings with a structured agenda.
- Agree terms of reference and review these regularly
- Ensure that as key staff change their roles, the importance of maintaining relationships is passed to the new person in the role. This should be considered as part of succession planning.

Expectations in terms of 3). Presentations / Interactive Sessions, 4). Hotel, 5). Event materials:

3. Presentations / Interactive Sessions

- I found the interactive sessions very thought provoking and there was some interesting and unexpected input on the table where I was sitting. I thought David and Victoria did a great job in presenting and facilitating discussion on some really tricky subject matter, which was stretching the comfort zone for many of the participants. Very well done, and well worth doing.
- Sessions were a revelation. The techniques used had a widely disparate group working as teams and reaching consensus on issues they would only otherwise debate. The separate discussions later showed how the techniques really opened people up to sharing and closer debate.
- Presentations were interesting. Is it possible to get the presentations (from Grangemouth and the Traffic Control Centre as well)?
- Interactive sessions: You lost me in the last 20 minutes of the session on Friday afternoon. It became too abstract. The other parts of the Friday were interesting and eye-opening.
- Excellent.
- Presentations were very informative and interesting.
- Good, perhaps the Miracle updates were too long / too much information. Suggestion for next time would be to do one in the morning, one after lunch etc.
- It was very good, that there were only few presentations and a lot more interaction than in most events. The presentations of the Miracle progress reports were sometimes lacking a statement of the overall goals and the project context and motivation. But this might be due to the fact that I have not attended earlier Miracle meetings.
- The interactive sessions were very interesting particularly from a methodological point of view. The preparation and the basis from which we started the horizon scanning activity were very good and well thought-through. It might be better to conduct such activities in a smaller group, though, and with a stronger focus towards the end of the exercise (scenarios and actions).
- Presentations were good, interactive and informative. The Grangemouth presentation was particularly interesting.
- Met my expectations.
- I was particularly impressed with the presentations and very much see the Rapid Reflection Model as a key toolkit in taking the CIR agenda forward.
- Very useful with the opportunity to contribute effectively.
- I found these sessions to be very beneficial and insightful. The interconnectedness workshop was very interesting.

4. Hotel

- We were very well looked after by the hotel and in all the facilities.
- Great venue for workshops, events, close to river and city, easy for people to enjoy the event and also get closer to Glasgow and Scottish life.
- Hotel: was very good. A pity that such a hotel charges you for Wi-Fi in your room.
- Good, free WIFI in the room would have been nice.
- Very good except for the fact that there was no internet access.

- Hotel was of a good standard; comfortable, with good food and excellent facilities. My only complaint about the hotel was the lack of WIFI in the rooms – which would have been useful. However, this is a minor point.
- Met my expectations.
- Very comfortable.

5. Event Materials

- Excellent materials provided in advance so we had the chance to absorb them.
- Materials covered all we needed, and having a card in the folder with the three key contacts phone numbers was a very useful addition.
- Sufficient.
- Excellent.
- Fine. It would be very beneficial if the presentations could be made available.
- Good.
- Well prepared.
- Event material was good, pushed out in good time and was clear and comprehensive. I was impressed with the administration throughout the visit.
- Met my expectations.
- Comprehensive and fit for purpose.

Additional comments?

- This was a very high quality event, one of the best I've attended. I'd like to commend the Scottish Government team who'd clearly put a lot of thought and effort into the planning. This included a real sense of everyone being made welcome and well looked after, and I believe this added to the value that participants contributed to the event.
- Thanks for great organisation.
- I am interested in being a member of the board of the International Network. If you are still looking for someone, just let me know.
- Overall the workshop was well balanced and an excellent opportunity to meet with experts in the field of Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP). The workshop met its objectives.
- No. Great job, thank you!
- I thoroughly enjoyed the CIR Conference; it was excellent, both in programme and people attending. I also managed to take a lot of insights home and transfer them to my security colleagues.
- I thought the level of attendees (drawn from stakeholders across Scotland and Europe) and their engagement was excellent.
- Excellent workshop, hopefully the topics discussed and suggestions made will be put into practice and further developed.

European MiRACLE Project.

Task 4 – Building a Multilevel Framework to Align Regional Critical Infrastructures Resilience Strategies with National and EU Policies

Delegate Responses to Questionnaire

<p>How effective/relevant to your work on CIR is the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection Directive (EPCIP)? (See Annex A for detail on EPCIP)</p>	<p>Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) is a very interesting and important aspect of the protection of the European Critical Infrastructure and work of the national CIPs in general, however in our case it has not been addressed per se. On the other hand the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) programme, following an all-hazards approach, even though it emphasises on terrorism, for the protection of the European Critical Infrastructures in the framework that has been established by the EU directive 2008/114/EC, refers to the resilience dimension even if it isn't explicitly stated.</p> <p>It is relevant. We are still developing a national approach to resilience, and as we progress the EPCIP can be useful.</p> <p>Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) is relevant in the context of work done with other agencies and an all of government approach to Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP). The implementation of the Directive is a government responsibility.</p> <p>It is very important because, at this moment, it is the only tool we have had to make main Critical Infrastructure (CI) operators sit around a working table to initiate cooperation with one another.</p>
<p>How effective/relevant to your work on CIR is the European CIP Network? (See Annex A for detail on the European CIP Network)</p>	<p>As mentioned before, even though Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) is not being addressed per se, the European Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Network, as it is reflected mostly on the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) and European Reference Network for Critical Infrastructure Protection (ERNCIP) platforms and via</p>

	<p>the coordination – collaboration of the National Contact Points (NCPs), known as CIPs, has continually referred to the resilience aspect as a part of the strategy for the protection of the European Critical Infrastructure, thus constituting a key factor. The information exchanged, through the European Critical Infrastructure Protection Network, plus the ongoing and future activities, not only within the EU countries, but also with countries like the USA and Canada, has always taken, under serious consideration, Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR).</p> <p>It surely is, also because people are involved and the solutions and lessons learned from other countries can be useful too.</p> <p>As an informal network it would be very relevant and beneficial to meet experts in the field.</p> <p>Feed into work at a national and local level and to develop an understanding of the future of critical infrastructure resilience challenges and to exchange good practices.</p> <p>None. Unfortunately we have no contact with that.</p>
<p>What are your arrangements for cross-sector CIR activity/collaboration at a National level and how effective/relevant are they?</p>	<p>Presently, cross-sector collaboration is on an ad-hoc basis. Due to this fact Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) activities are effective. However, Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) is not an established practice at a national level.</p> <p>We are working on these arrangements in our national project 'continuity of civil society'. The arrangements with our partners such as vital companies (water, energy etc) are very useful, just as are national and regional governments.</p> <p>As one national police agency we approach CIR in combination with other agencies in the field as an all-of government approach. This is led at a departmental level in which policy is developed. This is an effective strategy.</p> <p>At a national level we have no arrangements.</p>
<p>What are your arrangements at National level for collaboration with Regional CIR Networks and how</p>	<p>Our Country has been structured in a centralised way, where KEMEA as part of the Ministry of Public Order and Citizen Protection has the overall responsibility for implementing the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) Directive at a</p>

<p>effective/relevant are they?</p>	<p>national level and coordinating relevant Public Administration Authorities (e.g. Ministry of Transport and Environment, Energy and Climate Change). Regional CIR networks are not implemented and have been covered by the national network.</p> <p>The Safety Region structure forms an informal network of the organisations and parties. It is one of the primary tasks of a Safety Region. So we make these arrangements possible.</p> <p>Collaboration from National to Regional is carried out through an inter-agency structure which includes the principle response agencies and government departments. This is an effective strategy.</p> <p>At a national level we have no arrangements.</p>
<p>What are your arrangements at Regional level for cross-sector and multi-agency CIR collaboration and how effective/relevant are they?</p>	<p>Not applicable for our country, as it is structured using a different approach. We are still working to reinforce these arrangements. They should be strengthened.</p> <p>The infrastructure is identified at a Regional level and risk is calculated based on best practice and a consistent approach which feeds into the Regional work and upwards to a National level risk assessment process.</p> <p>At Regional level we have “the critical infrastructure protection agreement” between Critical Infrastructure Operators and Regional Government. It is effective with the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical infrastructure safety and security. • Citizen welfare. • Infrastructure service continuity.
<p>Do you think that there should be greater alignment between EU, National and Regional CIR strategies, policies and delivery programmes (If so, what are your three key suggestions in taking this forward)?</p>	<p>The concept of resilience is not equally understood and applied at an EU level.</p> <p>If Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) is viewed as an extension of the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP), then key suggestions would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harmonization of CIR concept and approach 2. Common OSP reference material with the active participation of all Member States (MBs) 3. Action to promote transfer of best practices, and generated knowledge and better exploitation of the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) and European Reference Network for Critical Infrastructure Protection (ERNICIP) in this process.

	<p>Yes. Because companies are not (always) bound by borders. For example Shell, which is situated in the Rotterdam Harbour, but is a big worldwide company. Rules and regulations (forced by government) should be the same all over the world and definitely in Europe.</p> <p>Key suggestion: get in touch with big 'European spread' companies. Can you invite them for a next meeting?</p> <p>Yes. In all EU Member States there is need for constant 'sound checks' on where EU, National and Regional Critical Infrastructure Resilience (CIR) Strategies, Policies and Delivery Programmes are on an on-going basis.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. More involvement by the EU Commission2. On-going inter-regional Cross Border activities such as workshops , meetings etc3. Meeting of National Experts in the field <p>Yes, of course. I think that it should improve all the Regional issues.</p>
--	---

European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection

The European Commission sets out the principles and instruments needed to implement the European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP), aimed at both European and national infrastructure.

This is enacted through communication from the Commission of 12 December 2006 on a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection [[COM\(2006\) 786](#) final – Official Journal C 126 of 7.6.2007].

SUMMARY

In December 2005, the Justice and Home Affairs Council called on the Commission to make a proposal for a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP). In response, the Commission adopted this communication and a proposal for a directive on the identification and designation of European critical infrastructure with a view to improving the protection of the latter.

The communication sets out the principles, processes and instruments proposed to implement EPCIP. The threats to which the programme aims to respond are not confined to terrorism, but also include criminal activities, natural hazards and other causes of accidents, using an all-hazards approach.

The general objective of EPCIP is to improve the protection of critical infrastructure in the European Union (EU). This will be achieved by implementing the European legislation set out in this communication.

The legislative framework for the EPCIP consists of the following:

- A procedure for identifying and designating European critical infrastructure and a common approach to assessing the need to improve the protection of such infrastructure. This will be implemented by means of a [directive](#).
- Measures designed to facilitate the implementation of EPCIP, including an EPCIP action plan, the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN), the setting up of Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) expert groups at EU level, CIP information sharing processes, and the identification and analysis of interdependencies.
- Support for EU countries regarding National Critical Infrastructures (NCIs) that may optionally be used by a particular EU country, and contingency planning.
- An external dimension.
- Accompanying financial measures, and in particular the Specific EU Programme on "[Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks](#)" for the period 2007-13, which will provide funding opportunities for CIP related measures.

EPCIP action plan

The ECPIP action plan has three main work streams:

- The first relates to the strategic aspects of EPCIP and the development of measures horizontally applicable to all CIP work.
- The second concerns the protection of European critical infrastructures and aims to reduce their vulnerability.
- The third is a national framework to assist EU countries in the protection of their NCIs.

The action plan is an ongoing process and regular reviews will be carried out.

Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN)

A warning network (the CIWIN) will be set up by a specific Commission proposal for the purposes of exchanging best practices and providing an optional platform for the exchange of rapid alerts linked to the Commission's ARGUS system.

Expert groups

Where specific expertise is needed, the Commission may set up CIP expert groups at EU level to address clearly defined issues. Depending on the sector of critical infrastructure, the functions of experts may include:

- assistance in identifying vulnerabilities, interdependencies and sectoral best practices.
- development of measures to reduce vulnerabilities and of performance metrics.
- formulation of case studies.

Information sharing on Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)

Stakeholders must share information on CIP, particularly on measures concerning the security of critical infrastructure and protected systems, interdependency studies and CIP related vulnerability, threat and risk assessments. At the same time, there must be assurance that shared information of a proprietary, sensitive or personal nature is not publicly disclosed and that any personnel handling classified information will have an appropriate level of security vetting by their EU country.

Identification of interdependencies

To make a better assessment of the weak points, threats or risks relating to critical infrastructures, interdependencies of a geographic or sectoral nature must be identified and analysed.

CIP Contact Group

The Commission plans to set up a contact group for the protection of critical infrastructure. The contact points will be designated by each EU country and will be

responsible for coordinating national CIP issues with other EU countries, the Council and the Commission.

Protection of National Critical Infrastructures (NCIs)

While recognising that the protection of NCIs is the responsibility of owners, operators and of EU countries themselves, the Commission does provide support in this area at the request of EU countries. Each EU country is encouraged to draw up a national protection programme including:

- classification of NCIs, taking account of the effects of disruption or destruction of a particular infrastructure (geographic extent of the damage and seriousness of the consequences).
- identification of geographic and sectoral interdependencies.
- contingency planning.

External dimension

An important aspect of EPCIP is the external dimension of CIP. The interconnected and interdependent nature of modern economies means that disruption to or destruction of a particular infrastructure may have consequences for countries outside the Union and vice versa. It is therefore essential to strengthen international cooperation in this area through sectoral agreements.

Accompanying financial measures

The EPCIP will be co-financed by the Community Programme "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks" for the period 2007-13.

Historical background

On 17 and 18 June 2004, the European Council asked the Commission to prepare an overall strategy to enhance the protection of critical infrastructure. In response, on 20 October 2004, the Commission published the communication "[Critical infrastructure protection in the fight against terrorism](#)".

The Commission's intention to propose a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) and a Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) was accepted by the European Council of 16 and 17 December 2004, both in its conclusions on prevention, preparedness and response to terrorist attacks and in the Solidarity Programme adopted by the Council on 2 December 2004.

Throughout 2005, intensive work was carried out on EPCIP. On 17 November 2005, the Commission adopted a Green Paper on a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection.

On 15 September 2005, a decision on the financing of a pilot project containing a set of preparatory actions with a view to strengthening the fight against terrorism was adopted. This was followed by a second decision on 26 October 2006 on financing the EPCIP pilot project.

On 12 December 2006, the Commission presented a proposal for a directive on the identification and designation of European critical infrastructures and a common approach to assess the need to improve their protection. On the same day, the Commission also adopted this communication. These documents give a clear idea of how the Commission proposes to address the issue of critical infrastructure protection in the EU.

Finally, the proposed EU Programme on "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks" was adopted on 12 February 2007.

Key terms used in the act

- Critical infrastructure: the physical and information technology facilities, networks, services and assets that, if disrupted or destroyed, would have a serious impact on the health, safety, security or economic well-being of citizens or the effective functioning of governments in EU countries.

RELATED ACTS

Proposal for a Council Decision of 27 October 2008 on a Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN) [[COM\(2008\) 676](#) final – Not published in the Official Journal].

As foreseen in the communication above, this separate proposal aims to establish the Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN). The CIWIN would provide EU countries with a secure information, communication and alert system for exchanging information relating to CIP. The system would facilitate cooperation between EU countries, allowing for exchanges on threats and vulnerabilities, as well as on strategies for improving the protection of critical infrastructure. EU countries' participation in the network would remain voluntary. The CIWIN would consist of an electronic forum and a rapid alert system, the first for exchanging information and the latter for alerts on risks and threats. It would be a secure classified system, where access to information is regulated accordingly. The development of the technical aspects of the CIWIN is the responsibility of the Commission.
Consultation procedure ([CNS/2008/0200](#))

Green Paper of 17 November 2005 on a European programme for critical infrastructure protection [[COM\(2005\) 576](#) final – Not published in the Official Journal].

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament of 20 October 2004 – [Preparedness and consequence management in the fight against terrorism](#) [[COM\(2004\) 701](#) final – Official Journal C 52 of 2.3.2005].

Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament of 20 October 2004 – [Prevention, preparedness and response to terrorist attacks](#) [COM(2004) 698 final – Official Journal C 14 of 20.1.2005].