

11 DR. LUIGI REBUFFI: Thank you, Bengt. So, ladies and
12 gentlemen, Mme. Lindberg, thank you for the invitation
13 to give me the opportunity to present the view of the
14 industry, but bring also the private sector in this
15 trans-Atlantic dialogue that you are establishing and
16 that we have heard yesterday there will be an agreement
17 between the European Commission and the DHS on research
18 and development.

19 From the private point of view I think that this
20 cooperation, trans-Atlantic dialogue, should be of
21 course extended not only at the administrative public
22 level but also to the private level. But this is my
23 message at the end, so let's start first from the
24 beginning. Quickly, I would like to introduce you
25 briefly what is the European Organization for Security.

28

1 And we have been after four years of discussion, we have
2 created this organization, which is a company but not
3 for profit, with a number of major European stakeholders
4 but also some research centers, some public
5 organizations. You see, you recognize probably in this
6 slide a number of well-known companies which are also
7 present here in this conference. So we are tackling
8 different sectors of security. Not only defense, but
9 also civil security and transport, security for
10 transport and so on.

11 Our objective is to create a sustainable European
12 security model and develop the European security market.
13 We have spent something like two years now with this
14 what usually are called competitors. We manage to have
15 them around the same table working different working
16 groups and try to develop a common view. A common view
17 which is given in a position paper that I mentioned
18 there, European -- EOS priority for a future European
19 security framework -- and now we are also issuing eight
20 white papers in the major areas which are mentioned
21 there like borders and so on. Big message there is that
22 you should see the research and development not like an
23 end per se, like an objective. For industry what we
24 want is to develop the business, provide the
25 administration, the citizens with best possible

1 technology and to have the economy running properly.

2 And that's the reason why we are proposing to the next

3 European Commission and the new European Parliament the

4 creation of a major European security program: Border

5 control, civil protection, service security and the

6 protection of critical infrastructure. This maybe

7 sounds evident to our American friends which are already

8 quite well organized in the Department of Homeland

9 Security, but this is still not the case in Europe. In

10 Europe we have a situation which is relatively, well,

11 quite fragmented. Let me put it that way. We have

12 issues of national sovereignty. We have different

13 legislation and regulation and standards. We have big

14 variety of legacy systems. The perception of threat and

15 the perception also we have seen of privacy is very

16 different in Europe and in different countries. I mean

17 in the UK we saw that they have so many CCTV, but they

18 hardly accept an ID card. In France they don't accept

19 CCTV, and they have everybody, also like in Sweden, ID

20 cards. So how you can move on with a common approach,

21 let me say. So how do we define common requirement to

22 build up, let me say, a consistent, homogeneous market

23 and homogeneous approach to security? That's the point.

24 So that was my point. That's the definition of common

25 operational needs and dialogue with the user and

30

1 operator. And also we have seen that only recently in
2 the first communication from the European Commission
3 there is a request for the definition of an internal
4 security strategy. So we are just at the beginning of
5 that story, and these should give us the guidelines how
6 to go further in the development and the deployment of
7 solutions which are following this security strategy.
8 It seems that we are not doing today yet what we are
9 developing -- there's no strategy. No, actually we are
10 following national strategy. What we would like to have
11 is a common strategy. And on top of that of course we
12 have the agreement for the Lisbon Treaty with possible
13 extent of an international role of Europe and the
14 discussion on the civil-military role and the budget
15 which is always lacking, let me say, for this kind of
16 development. But I would like to go very briefly on
17 this slide. These are according to us the main drivers
18 of the security market especially in Europe where we
19 have an evolution of the traditional threats into high
20 level security threats. We see also, for instance, on
21 civilian threats which is demanding a high level of
22 research, and research and technology. We have to
23 develop flexible capabilities in what we call a global
24 approach, linking different application and also
25 end-to-end approach. We need also a better strategy
31

1 from the public decision-maker, or as we said previously
2 we need a strategy to have appropriate investment if the
3 threat perception is changing, is the requirement
4 changing every year or every two-year how we can invest
5 on research. How we can have a return on this. And
6 also top of that we see that statistics may be not
7 correct the figure, not exactly, but we see that we
8 estimate that there's a factor of roughly ten between
9 the expenditure of research in Europe and the United
10 States, which makes a big difference. And also we have
11 seen that in Europe discussed a lot yesterday already
12 about the privacy issues and to increase very sensitive
13 in Europe different countries as we said previously,
14 different perception, but to increase the citizen trust.
15 This means that we have to manage this intrusive
16 national security, and this means added cost. Maybe
17 also an added value because at the end it will be easier
18 to sell on the market, but nevertheless high investment
19 in the beginning. And also a message we heard yesterday
20 also from ESRIIF is that we need a global security
21 solution with enhanced interoperability across the
22 member states and more security and privacy by design
23 and less added on solution. Well, I added here now this
24 chart that you probably for sure you cannot read. This
25 I took it from my friend Tom, and this is the product
32

1 realization chart that many of you know is already from
2 the DHS. This is the chart where the DHS is developing,
3 although Tom will explain much better than me, from the
4 needs on the left to basic research to technology
5 development and to, let me say, deployment on the right
6 side. And why I put this here is that because in Europe
7 with the European Commission we stop the process in the
8 middle more or less. Don't get me to the letter. But
9 we stop the process in the middle. We still have to
10 build on all the phases like, for instance, mentioned
11 there you have U.S. Safety Act, you have the
12 certification procedure? We are still envisaging
13 something there, but we are still far away from that.
14 We are still a little bit -- we are just talking now
15 about making some demonstration project, pilot project,
16 now starting being accepted, but no more than that, and
17 it's tough. It's tough to go to the market.
18 So also other issues concerning the regulation.
19 Regulation is very important for shaping the market, but
20 in Europe we have not sufficient guidelines from the
21 European Commissions on a clear regulation on different
22 areas. Even where we have regulation they are not
23 sufficiently detailed. For instance, in the civil
24 aviation, with the liquids and all, in general all the
25 regulation concerning airport security, we do have
33

1 regulations since 2002, updated in 2008, but still
2 they're very not sufficiently detailed to allow one
3 level of investment and also homogeneous level of
4 security across the different countries. You well know
5 that when you go -- I don't know. Maybe when you're
6 traveling from the States, when you visit, you go to
7 Rome, you have to take off the belt. When you go to
8 Paris, you have to take off the shoes. Why for that?
9 What's the difference? It's just an example. But we
10 have hard -- hard time to understand why there is so
11 different treatment, different procedure and different
12 technology sometimes used across Europe. So then also
13 we don't have a common validation and certification of
14 the solution and the procedure. Each country has their
15 own accreditation system, their own certification
16 system, but we don't have something in common. Now
17 there is a proposal coming up from discussion in
18 Brussels that there is a need for a European network for
19 test and validation of innovative security and solution
20 and services to try to help this deployment. But still
21 we cannot have and we will hardly have in the short time
22 some European certification, because to have an
23 harmonization of the different countries on these topics
24 will be quite difficult in a short time. In U.S. you
25 have the U.S. Safety Act, which really helps you in
34

1 providing liability limitation. We do not have this in
2 Europe. And still it's under discussion in Brussels if
3 we do need this. Well, in EOS we have developed the
4 suggestion. This will be tackled in the following --
5 well, maybe discussing the U.S. Safety Act will be
6 tackled in the following round of speakers, but I'm
7 sorry I have to leave very quickly after so I cannot
8 stay in the discussion. I have to go to the ministry.
9 But what we are suggesting, if they could be also in
10 Europe, a limitation of liability for the technology and
11 services, but not like in U.S. on a product basis but on
12 an event basis. When there is a terrorist act then you
13 apply this suggested regulation. And what you apply is
14 not global European, but the rule -- we apply the rule
15 where the security technology or the services are of a
16 national accreditation. So you apply the rule of the
17 country where have been sold according to a value
18 limited -- the liability limited to a value given
19 according to the security services or technology
20 supplied. So I don't want to go more on this
21 discussion, just to say that we have discussed this. We
22 are proposing something, but we do think that we do need
23 to help the result of the innovation of the research to
24 be deployed also via this also in Europe. And what we
25 are proposing is that we don't have to see, as I said,
35

1 at beginning research as an objective per se, but it
2 should be part of a clear implementation of the
3 policies, European policies driven not only by political
4 discussion but also economic and societal needs. So we
5 see this, the research, like in the frame of the
6 public-private, what we call public-private end-to-end
7 security programs that I mentioned before. End to end
8 from policy and regulation standards, pilots,
9 procurement, deployment and services. I mentioned
10 before that the four security program, the four areas,
11 the border, civil protection, the cyber security and the
12 CIP, now we have to see the four -- these are the four
13 major areas. Now to give some priorities and actually
14 thinking about this, it was discussed yesterday, I
15 changed some of my presentation overnight because I want
16 to see this is the point in Europe. What can we do if
17 we want to really have a cooperation between industry
18 and the cooperation with the administration? Because
19 it's nice to say, okay, we go for R&D, but first message
20 we want to go beyond R&D. We want to have a dialogue of
21 cooperation public-private with the administration, and
22 third we have to start on priorities. We have a list of
23 four major themes, and if I get the last slide, so first
24 point is, okay, we could set up a kind of public-private
25 advisory group to define this, concrete priorities for
36

1 dialogue and cooperation. But then I said, okay, maybe
2 I could suggest something more to be provocative with
3 you and say, okay, border control is maybe sensitive.
4 Cyber security for sure it's common, we have common
5 problem across the Atlantic on cyber security, but it's
6 still difficult to define the -- profile the area and so
7 on. So maybe there's an area where it could be maybe
8 easier and more interesting to start to get a real
9 dialogue and cooperation could be civil protection, the
10 protection of the citizens, kinds of natural disasters,
11 for instance, which is valid in the country, internal in
12 our countries, but also abroad as we see these days with
13 the earthquake and the tsunami in the Pacific. And on
14 top of that also we could work on some standardization
15 issues in a different domain we mentioned before. So
16 this is just a suggestion to you, but I would say
17 please, and playing with the word of industry, "thrust"
18 with an H, please trust in industry thrust. Thank you.